PEACE AND REFORM,

AGAINST

WAR AND CORRUPTION.

[PRICE THREE SHILLINGS.]

5/0
35-

PEACE AND REFORM,

AGAINST

WAR AND CORRUPTION.

IN

ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,

WRITTEN BY ARTHUR YOUNG, ESQ.

ENTITLED

"The EXAMPLE of FRANCE A WARNING to BRITAIN."

THE FOURTH EDITION.

BY DANIEL STUART.

"*I shall always have the Satisfaction to have aimed sincerely at Truth and "Usefulness, though in one of the meanest Ways.*"

LOCKE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. RIDGWAY, YORK-STREET, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE.

1795.

Harvard College Library
21 Oct. 1939
Deposited by Bus. Sch. Library

FREEMASONS TAVERN, *Saturday, March* 15, 1794.

At an Extraordinary and Numerous Meeting of the SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE, *associated for the Purpose of obtaining a* PARLIAMENTARY REFORM, *held this Day,*

COLONEL NORMAN MACLEOD, M. P.

IN THE CHAIR,

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY,

That the Thanks of this Society be given to the Author of the Pamphlet entitled "PEACE *and* REFORM "*againſt* WAR *and* CORRUPTION," *and that the ſaid Pamphlet be recommended for peruſal.*

TO THE

SOCIETY

OF THE

FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE,

ASSOCIATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING A

PARLIAMENTRY REFORM,

THIS PAMPHLET,

AS A SMALL MARK OF THE RESPECT OF THE AUTHOR,

AND OF HIS GRATITUDE,

FOR THE NOTICE WITH WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN PLEAESD TO HONOUR IT,

IS INSCRIBED,

BY THEIR MOST OBLIGED,

AND

HUMBLE SERVANT,

DANIEL STUART.

Frith-Street,
Soho,
7th April, 1794.

PEACE AND REFORM,

AGAINST

WAR AND CORRUPTION.

AN attentive perusal of many political Pamphlets, produced in the beginning of the present year*, and an opinion that it would not be difficult to expose the fallacy of the arguments upon which were founded the most popular of those written against the Cause of Freedom, led me first to think of attempting their refutation; and some leisure during the autumn months, enabled me to try what I had previously wished to have seen done by any abler hand. I have espoused that side which is, for the moment, the least popular; and obscure as both this Pamphlet and its Author may be, I am therefore prepared to expect some small share of that obloquy, which is now so largely bestowed on all those who presume to question the wisdom of the measures of government. Secured from danger by power, and uncontradicted by reason, because of the danger, the advocates of Corruption have of late exulted, almost unopposed, in their triumph. The most moderate Favourers of Reform have been blended with the most insane

* This Pamphlet was principally written in the Autumn of 1793, and was first published in the December following.

Zealots for Revolution ; Toleration and Atheism, Peace and Regicide, have been by the supporters of abuses wickedly deemed, and by the multitude weakly believed, to be synonymous terms.

The national understanding thus misled and prejudiced ; the temper of a very great majority of the People rendered furious and vindictive ; the partizans, and the partakers of Corruption bold, active, and cruel ; the current has been, from necessity, suffered of late to run wholly in favour of the most absolute Toryism. Few men would enter on a labour so perilous and unacceptable as that of exposing the Delusion. To incur odium from the many, for the approbation of the already approving few ; to write cramped up as much as if pinioned in the Pillory, lest it should actually be the reward ; to oppose reason to passion, and be certain of being unsuccessful whether right or wrong, were considerations sufficient to intimidate Prudence by the danger of the attempt, and by its hopelessness, even to silence the most honest Zeal in the cause of Freedom.

Accordingly, the Press last winter was much more occupied by Tory, or High Church and King opinions, than two years before it had been by those of an opposite description. Their abundance was even greater than the harvest which followed the labours of Mr. Burke ; and although their arguments may be futile and ridiculous, they cannot fully be answered while Newgate and the Pillory are called in to support them.

The first Pamphlet that suggested to me the idea of endeavouring to expose those exploded, inconsistent, mischievous Doctrines, was that of Mr. Arthur Young. Several reasons induced me to think it a proper object of animadversion ; for although, on the first perusal, it appeared to be such a jumble of contradictions, falsehoods, and even

libels

libels on that Constitution which it professed to defend, that I did not believe common sense could endure it, yet on reading the approbation of Mr. Reeves, and finding it had been circulated with great industry, I concluded it might be of some use to refute what I thought so susceptible of refutation; and while the apparent easiness of the task seemed to set its accomplishment within my reach, an object so inglorious did not promise to provoke a Rival. Mr. Reeves, by his approbation, has adopted its opinions as his own; and, however worthless it may be in itself, it no doubt derives some consequence from being thus promulgated as the Manifesto of his Committee.

Its design is to deter us from making a Parliamentary Reform, by exciting our horror at the atrocities which have taken place in France: these atrocities Mr. Young falsely ascribes to the principles of Liberty, and asserts, that Englishmen would be equally guilty with their neighbours, if once they began political improvement. In *Reform* he predicts the destruction of *Property*, and attempts to establish as a fact, that a government more purely representative than our own is at present, could not long exist without an Agrarian Law; thus insidiously alarming all men of wealth, inciting them to discourage any amendment in the Construction of the House of Commons, and advising them to join in the war against the French, as the only means of preserving whatever they hold dear. To follow him regularly through every falsehood and absurdity would neither be entertaining nor useful. I shall therefore begin with some instances of his shallow craft: and I shall shew that the crimes of France, so far from having any natural connection with her principles, are the very same which the rage of Faction has led the Friends of War and Corruption in England, if not

to

to perpetrate, at least to recommend in support of Principles directly opposite; and which, if admitted to be proof against the principles of French Liberty, must also be proof against the principles of Mr. Young and the other English Tories, as the blind advocates of each system equally applaud them. After having discussed these, and a few other preliminary matters, I shall proceed to the consideration of the two great questions, REFORM and PEACE, against which Mr. Young and his fellow labourers have raised so many prejudices.

His disingenuousness is evident at the commencement of his book, the very foundation of which is laid on palpable misrepresentation. He owns himself to have been a "warm friend" to the first Revolution, yet he condemns Mr. Paine, Major Cartwright, &c. for their writings in defence of it. He reprobates them for having done what he himself did, yet he does not own he did wrong. Had he like others repented his mistake, and made his recantation, he then, with a better grace, might have attacked those with whom he formerly had agreed; and like Mr. Pitt in the last debate on Parliamentary Reform, might have maintained, that consistency was a proof of a want of judgment, and that it was always to be presumed those were in an error who did not change their opinion.

"The Revolution before the 10th of August" (says Mr. Young) "was as different from the Re-
"volution after that day as light from darkness;
"as clearly distinct in principle and practice as
"Liberty and Slavery. The same principles
"which directed me to approve the Revolution in
"its commencement, the principles of real Liberty,
"led me to detest it after the 10th of August."
Here he asserts his approbation of the Revolution up to the 10th of August, which he acknowledges

was

was conducted, till that period, on the principles of *real Liberty*; and he also says in the same page, (4) "How little reason therefore to reproach me "with sentiments *contrary* to those I published "before the 10th of August; I am *not* changeable, "but steady and consistent."

Compare this with page 21, where, in speaking of the Revolution, he affirms, "it has brought "more misery, poverty, devastation, imprison-"ment, bloodshed and ruin, on France, in *four* "*years*, than the old government did in a century." —If the "*principles* and *practice* of the Revolution "up to the 10th of August were conformable with "real liberty," how could they have brought misery, poverty, &c. on France for *four years*? How comes it that he approves the devastation, bloodshed, and ruin *before* the 10th of August, and yet disapproves of them afterwards?—But it is in fact the old Despotism he contends for, which (p. 33) he calls "the mildest and most benignant govern-"ment in Europe, our own only excepted; a go-"vernment cruelly libelled in the character given "by one of our reforming Orators."—Mr. Young, however, libels it still more in his own Travels, published long after the Revolution, where, speaking of the natural richness of France, he says "the "dispensations of Providence seem to have permit-"ted the human race to exist only as the prey of "Tyrants, as it has made pigeons for the prey of "hawks.—Oh! if I were a legislator of France, I "would make such great lords skip again!"—Yet this is the government which he now calls "re-"gular and mild.*"—I would not quote these passages, if Mr. Young had owned that his approbation of the first Revolution had been misplaced: But, on the contrary, he affirms he is "steady and "consistent."

* P. 49.

Mr.

Mr. Paine's works he treats as if they had been written and published since the 10th of August, 1792. The panegyrics contained in "The Rights "of Man" on the Constitution of 1789—a constitution of which Mr. Young declares his unaltered approbation—are falsely and artfully tortured into panegyrics on the Convention, and the events that have taken place since the destruction of monarchy. For instance, he gives part of a speech of Marat in January 1793, wherein the Convention is called "a scandalous spectacle—an assembly of madmen "and furies," and immediately follows it by observing, that "Paine is of a contrary opinion, he "said they debate in the language of gentlemen; "their dignity is serene, &c." These passages in Paine were published long before the 10th of August: with equal justice, therefore, might the eulogium of Mr. Burke, on the character of the French people, prior to 1789, be quoted as the eulogium on the massacres of the second of September.

But Mr. Young's reasonings are not more inconsistent with the opinions he pretends to entertain, than they are with each other; for "The "example of France, a warning to Britain," may not improperly be called "The example of France "an example to Britain." It reproaches the French with destroying the Liberty of the Press, and advises the very same thing to be done in England: it condemns the principle of arming one class of men against another, and soon afterwards sets forth the necessity of following the example here, by arming the rich against the poor; and the violation of the freedom of election at Paris is held up to derision, while corruption and prescriptive election in England are applauded as the true foundation of national prosperity. Indeed he is not singular in these blunders, for bloodshed and rapine would

be

be equally practised in this country as in France, if we may take the *will* for the *deed*. Here the theory has been instilled and admired; there the practice has been adopted. And the only difference between the French and English Marats—a difference which does not diminish their guilt—is, that the one would assassinate all who deny, and the other would assassinate all who maintain the sovereignty of the people.

The faults of the Convention, of public bodies, and even of individuals, are carefully collected and detailed as the deliberate acts not only of those who rule in France, but of the whole nation. The most false assertion or the most wicked counsel, though coming from an insignificant fool or disregarded madman, is sufficient to excite Mr. Young's execration, and to criminate a whole people. How little less guilty can the reasonable part of mankind think this kingdom, if their judgment is formed in the same manner. Crimes equally detestable have been preached and vindicated in this country by persons of eminent station; and if the sanguinary scenes of Paris have not been repeated in London, Manchester, and Birmingham, it is not for the want of British Marats, and Robespierres to instigate and protect the instruments. If assassination is to be committed, it is indifferent to me who are the objects, or what are the motives;—whether the victim be a plunderer of the poor industrious Swinish Multitude, or of pampered tyrannical Nobles, and lazy mischievous Priests. The offence is as heinous in the one case as in the other; and justice might be as much violated, were Marat or Robespierre, as if Windham or Burke were to be murdered with impunity.

As a companion to Mr. Young's shocking picture

picture of France, I shall give the outline of a proposed one in England. But if my colouring be not so bold as his, it must be accounted for in the peculiar circumstances under which I write, rather than in the weakness of my subject. What he says of Chabot, Robespierre, or Danton, it may be dangerous to say of a priest, a counsellor, or a judge in England. He might decorate his tales with the most glaring falsehood and rancorous calumny, and be in unison with the nation and in favour with the government. The disapprobation of the one, and resentment and vengeance of the other, might be my lot, were I to indulge equally in much better grounded invective. His reasoning is enforced by aids which it would be imprudent, probably dangerous, for me to use; for when it is difficult to demonstrate his argument, or sustain his assertion, he attacks humanity with a pike, a dagger, or a guillotine, and, addressing himself, to the feelings, instead of the understanding, triumphantly exults in his absurdity and falsehood.

If "Marat's grand specific of cutting off "150,000 heads*" be compared with Mr. Reeves's "excess of virtue to exterminate the Dissent-"ers†," which shall we think most criminal? There are more than 150,000 dissenting heads in Britain, therefore Mr. Reeves outdoes Marat: but, on the other hand, we must recollect that he does it in a more delicate manner. Marat spoke roundly out; Mr. Reeves only *insinuates*. Marat's, however, were words, and might have been the ebullition of the moment; but Mr.

* Young, p. 69.

† *Vide* the *original* publication of Thomas Bull to John Bull, owned and apologized for by Mr. Reeves; and also the Comments of Mr. Fox in his Speech, Dec. 13, 1792.

Reeves's

Reeves's was a deliberate act, which, from its nature, must have been considered and approved by a body of men, the Crown and Anchor Committee. In whatever way we compare these two proscriptions, we shall find them equally culpable; but their effects in this country were very different. Marat's advice has been the theme of horror in every company, though it did not extend to them; on the contrary, Mr. Reeves's has been little noticed, though there are very few persons who have not some friends among the dissenters, and consequently were affected by it. The more we examine the characters of these two gentlemen, the greater similarity we shall find between them. How far they have been justly rewarded, I shall not pretend to decide: Mr. Reeves, besides enjoying about half a dozen places under government, has lately been paid between three and four thousand pounds—Marat has been assassinated.

Mr. Reeves, in his "reflections on the present "crisis," says, "it would be well if those who dis-"like the English Constitution would remove to "another region." What decree of the Convention would occasion emigration more certainly than this sentiment if it had the power? And Judge Ashurst, in his charge to the grand jury on the 19th of November, 1792, at the very moment the decree of fraternity was passing in France, declared, "there "have, however, under the best systems of govern-"ment, been found men of corrupt principles, who, "having forsaken honest industry, wish to throw "every thing into confusion, and to live by rapine "and plunder; when that is the case, it is become "necessary for the coercive power of the state to "lend its restraining hand, and to punish offences "of such a flagrant nature. There is no prospect "of reformation, till such *corrupt members* be *cut*

"*off**." It is not very difficult to imagine the wide sense which would be given to the last expression by the inflamed populace, among whom this charge was liberally distributed.

The Fast Day, instead of being passed in conformity with its professed purpose, in humiliation before God, in prayers for the conversion of unbelievers, the reformation of ourselves, and the general peace and happiness of mankind; instead of a day on which every priest made an extraordinary exertion of his powers in imploring the benevolence of the Almighty to enlighten the minds, to soften the hearts, and to spare the blood of his people, was chiefly celebrated by the most dreadful maledictions. The Supreme Being, who, true religion tells us, enjoins brotherly love, forgiveness, humanity and virtue, was addressed by our divines as if he had been more merciless and blood-thirsty than any divinity that ever disgraced paganism; and the temples of the God of Peace were made to resound with imprecations, from which even our ancestors would have recoiled when engaged in the worship of their ferocious Odin, whom they revered as "the "terrible and severe God; the active roaring "deity; the father of slaughter; the God that car-"rieth desolation and fire, and nameth those that "are to be slain†."

The solemnity of the scene was well calculated for rousing and misleading the passions, and every artifice was employed to excite hatred towards the French, and provoke us to fury. The priesthood as well as the princes felt themselves interested in the cause, and their zeal shook the pulpit with exhortations to vengeance. The Bishop of Gloucester, before the House of Lords, thus spoke of that na-

* *Vide* the Ministerial Gazette, the Times of November 20th, always very correct in its law reports.

† See the Edda.

tion;

tion ;—" infatuated and remorseless people! The " measure of your iniquities seems at length to be " full; the hour of retribution is coming fast upon " you! drunk with the blood of your fellow-citi- " zens, you have dared to spread your ravages " abroad; rousing the surrounding nations, in jus- " tice to themselves and the common cause of huma- " nity, to confederate against you, *in order to execute* " *the wrath of God on your devoted heads.*" His lordship, however, might have been restrained from such rash denunciations of divine judgment, by the awful admonitions of the founder of that religion which he pretended to preach."

" And Jesus answering, said, suppose ye these " Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, " because they suffered such things? I tell you " nay,—But except ye repent, ye shall all likewise " perish."

" And those eighteen on whom the Tower of Si- " loam fell and slew them, think ye that they were " sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? " I tell you nay: but except ye repent, ye shall " all likewise perish*."

The other Fast Day Sermons were in unison with that of the Bishop of Gloucester, a very few only excepted. The Rev. J. Gardener, at Taunton, said, " Shall we not labour to bring such persons" (as the French, and Reformers in general) " to a " proper sense of their duty, *or exterminate them* " *and their opinions?*" and the Rev. Mr. Bromeley, at Fitzroy Chapel, hoped "that the reckoning which " God will make will not be long delayed against " a nation," (France) " which is certainly behind no " other whose measure of iniquities has in any re- " cords of time *called forth his vengeance to erase it*

* St. Luke, c. xiii.

" *from*

"*from the earth**." These are the sentiments of our high church pastors: Such is the religion, the benevolence, the humanity, they teach! To exterminate for opinion! What more did Marat ever desire! To be the instrument of God in executing his vengeance! Mahomet used the same plea for all his murders and rapine. To erase a whole nation from the earth!!!—Neither Mahomet, Marat, nor Robespierre, have equalled this! How limited and insignificant have been their proscriptions compared with those of our own pious pastors, who would "seal on the forehead as the servants of "God †," all those who make war against France; who would "send myriads of locusts, with crowns "like gold upon their heads, and faces like men, "invested with scorpion power to torture the un-"sealed" enthusiasts of that distracted nation, and "let loose the angels of the Euphrates to slaughter "a third of mankind ‡!"

Similar passages from the sermons preached on that *Christian* day would fill a volume. Most of them tend to inflame the people to a war of extermination, and insinuate the destruction of those who desire a Parliamentary Reform. Surely our divines cannot imagine these harangues gratifying to the Head of the Church? Their affection towards the crown, indeed, is natural. The Bishop of Durham's promotion has taught them the road to preferment, and my Lord of Gloucester has been long looking for a translation:—but not such as Elijah's: His present ambition looks no higher than Canterbury.

Nor were the sermons openly preached more inflammatory than the writings anonymously pub-

* These passages are taken from the sermons published under the names of those divines.

† *Vide* Revelations, c. vii. v. 3,

‡ *Vide* Revelations, c. ix.

lished

lished by our High-Church Men, one of whom, in Birmingham, under the fictitious name of Job Nott, thus speaks of those whom he calls "New-"fashioned, restless Dissenters," and the members of a society instituted on the principles of Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond for procuring a Reform of Parliament. "Do be off—only think "of the New Drop—you may be recorded in the "Newgate Calendar—transportation may reform "you—*you deserve to be highly exalted*—Did you "ever see the New Drop?" and concludes with wishing that these Dissentersand Reformers, whom he deems factious, "tied in their garters may "swing." Yet this elegant author calls himself a friend to conciliation and unanimity, a *moderate* man, a man of *peace!* He may be so for a *Birmingham* man; but if such are the friends to peace and moderation in that town, can we wonder at the atrocities which have taken place there, and still may be repeated, while Job Nott and such publications are publicly sold with a bookseller's name to them, and are even boasted of by their authors *?

Members of both Houses of Parliament have acted in unison with the church, and have also repeatedly insisted that a war of extermination is the only thing which can save this country. The defence of the riot at Manchester equals the exhortations of the pulpit. We not only find riots indirectly recommended, but openly vindicated. Unlawful violence against a man for his political opinions is justified in the BritishHouse of Commons! Here the "Sacred dutyof insurrection" is preached as unequivocally as ever itwas in France,whereactual and excessive danger is in some degree a palliation of cri-

* One very curious article contained in Job Nott, designed probably to give confidence to the Church and King Partizans, is, "that Sir Robert Lawley never is kept waiting by Mr. Pitt; "*when* he sends in word, it is on *Birmingham business*."

minality.

minality. But in England no justification of similar atrocities could be shewn, except in the unfounded apprehensions artfully excited by a false and pernicious alarm.

Mr. Reeves's Committee, detected in their outset, insinuating it to be an excess of virtue to exterminate the Dissenters, did not alter their course, though they more carefully concealed their proceedings. The streets were over-run with the most violent inflammatory libels; the war-whoop against Dissenters and Reformers was sung at every corner; and, if assassination was not committed, it was not for want of prompters. Some of the hand-bills and ballads in circulation last winter would even have shocked Mr. Burke! And it is fortunate that the lower had more discretion and humanity than the higher ranks of persons who encouraged such publications, otherwise we might have had a Tory *Second* of *September* in England, and the bloody anniversary might have been celebrated by our Bigots, as a distinguished *red* letter day in the "Church and King" Calendar.

Not one of the authors or distributors of those incendiary papers was even seized, much less punished: but a poor bill-sticker, who could not read, was tried and imprisoned for posting up bills in favour of a Parliamentary Reform; and Holt, the printer, at Newark, has been convicted of a libel for re-printing a paper on the same subject, which was circulated by Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond when they contended for that measure; and which it is not improbable was originally written by his Grace, as it strongly contends for Universal Representation.

I shall not comment on what Mr. Young repeatedly insinuates, though he does not plainly desire, by such passages as "The King of France died "on the scaffold, because he would not shed the blood

" blood of Traitors, Conspirators and Rebels; " he listened to those who petitioned for Reform;" and I shall also pass over the many oral threats of assassination made by individuals, the anonymous letters to the same effect, one of which at Staines, threatened the house and life of Mr. Fox, and conclude this slight sketch, of the desire of some men, to see " Church and King" massacres in this country, by giving as an epitome of the others, an extract from a hand-bill, circulated at Exeter, in December 1792. " Our noble King hath made a fine " speech from the throne to his Parliament, as must " be acknowledged by every well-wisher to his " country, and as for them that do not like that " and the present CONSTITUTION, let them have " their deserts, that is a HALTER and a GIBBET, and " be burnt afterwards, not as PAINE hath been, " in effigy, but in body and person. To which " every loyal heart will say Amen!"

These facts, I think, are sufficient to justify me in asserting, that the assassinations, and other crimes in France, are not detested by certain persons in this country on account of their enormity, but that those who execrate most bitterly, only wish to imitate them on a different class of victims. Marat's fall was regretted by our Tories, because he laid the eggs of mischief; and the death of the King of France, was declared in the House of Commons, by a member of Administration, to be, in some respects, a fortunate circumstance as it roused the British Nation to War.

The animating soul of Mr. Young's book being the atrocities of the French, which he falsely ascribes to their principles, I have thought it necessary at my commencement to shew, that, according to his own reasoning, he condemns his own principles, since the same atrocities have been recommended by the advocates for his opinions; and, that if I might

might indulge in the same furious execration, I could find sanguinary doctrines enough in England to balance against him; to mislead and inflame those who swallow assertion for fact, and invective for argument. I do not, however, defend the crimes of the French, although I think, as far as crimes can be excused, no people in the world ever had more to plead in extenuation, because no people in the world ever were so irritated by internal treachery, and alarmed by external danger.

But to condemn opinions or institutions for crimes which are committed by their real or pretended supporters, is both gross fallacy, and flagrant injustice. The most clear principles, and the most salutary institutions, are open to the attack of such sophistry. Suppose I were inclined to condemn the British Government in Church and State, because the riots and excesses in Birmingham were in behalf of Church and King, would any man of sense admit such events as full proof that our Constitution is fundamentally vicious? Yet, if I were to argue thus, I should only imitate Mr. Young. I might like him say, "the *theory* of the "English religion is *peace* but the *practice* is *riot*;--- "the preachers of it tell us to have good will to- "wards our neighbours, yet they instigate a mob to "fire and plunder them. As for their kingly go- "vernment, it is still worse. The people pay "about twenty millions annually for *protection*, but "at Birmingham the rabble are permitted to *burn* "and *rob* for a week together; and if it so happens "that they have destroyed your whole property, "and you have not a long purse to go to law, you "can have no redress:---If you are completely "ruined, you are completely excluded from jus- "tice.---Such is the British Government---Such is "their glorious Constitution!---But in preference

"to

" to it give me the simple despotism of Prussia :
" At Magdebourg I can go to sleep in safety :---at
" Birmingham I may expect to be awakened amidst
" the flames of their hellish Church and King Go-
" vernment."

In 1780, Mr. Young might still have condemned the protestant religion---not more justly---but more speciously. If he had written on the 6th of June, in that year, he might with the same fairness with which he treats the French, have said, " The protestant religion is a bayonet in your " breast, or a bullet in your bosom: In *theory* it " teaches to do unto others as you would have " them do unto you ; in *practice*, it teaches fire, " plunder, devastation, and bloodshed. The pro- " testants *entreat* redress *by petition*, and assault, " wound, or threaten those who are to grant it: " They pray for their enemies, and burn the " houses and chapels of those who do not offend " them: They declaim against drunkenness, and " get so beastly drunk, that they are consumed in " the diabolical flames of their own kindling: " they recommend honesty and mercy, yet empty " the gaols of felons and murderers whom they " make their associates. Their *theory* instils *virtue*, " but their practice approves only of *vice*. They " enlighten mankind by a general conflagration, " and send souls to heaven by bludgeon and halter " worship. Such is the protestant religion ! Give " me paganism. Among the Tartars I may sit in " safety under my own fig-tree. No sanguinary " rapacious protestant, with the creed in one hand " and a bludgeon in the other, will, in Thibet, de- " mand money at my door and threaten to burn " my house: THERE I MIGHT BE IN SAFETY."

In this manner Mr. Young might condemn the British government and religion, by blaming them for the crimes committed in popular commotions,

the best of governments cannot always prevent; and from these as reasonably draw conclusions unfavourable to them, as he has done to the French Revolution, by applying the crimes of individuals, or the temporary accidental confusion and mischief in France, to the principles which actuate the mass of the people.

Proscription and cruelty are not the only parts of the conduct of the French which have been imitated in this country. We had our Tory *Jacobin* Associators, at the St. Alban's Tavern, and our more furious and degraded *Club of Cordeliers* in the Crown and Anchor Committee. If in Paris "Persons have been imprisoned by order of indi-"viduals," others, at home, have been voted in a state of accusation, upon the authority of anonymous letters transmitted to Mr. Reeves. The affiliated Jacobin Clubs of the French Provinces have been made the model of the Reevesian Associations and Committees, against Republicans and Levellers at home; and in the English Parochial, as well as in the French Popular Meetings, the Constitution, as declared by Reeves, Pitt, and Co. has been formally approved. Every President or Chairman of these "*Conventions*" becomes a "*Mu-*"*nicipal Inquisitor:*" Sir Joseph Banks makes his *visites domiciliares* in the parish of St. Anne, and keeps a register of the complexion, age, employment, &c. of lodgers and strangers. The "*section*" of St. James's *denounces* for *incivism* every housekeeper who does not oblige his servants, workmen, and apprentices, to sign their acceptance of the Constitution. No tradesman is to be employed, who has not been *fraternized* by the officers of his "*district*;" no publican is to be licenced who has not reported *suspected persons*. Every man is called upon, more palpably than in France, to declare our Constitution glorious and unreformable; and if any

any one is more conſiſtent than Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond, and ſignifies a wiſh for the removal of abuſes in the conſtruction of the Houſe of Commons, he is branded as a Jacobin, and, if poſſible, utterly ruined. Is not this governing by the very ſame means, ſo much execrated in the French; by mobs, by terror, by popular coercion? The great maſs of people, from the higheſt to the loweſt ranks, are ſummoned to conſtitute themſelves into partial arbitrary tribunals to acquit or to condemn.

Before I proceed further, it will be proper, by the moſt indiſputable proofs, to ſhew Mr. Young's apoſtacy, as it is a ſubject to which I ſhall frequently allude. In the firſt impreſſions of this pamphlet, I was leſs anxious on this point than to counteract the miſchievous opinions circulated in "The Example of France, &c." and ſuch publications: But Mr. Young has written ſo excellently for this purpoſe; he compoſed ſo infallible an antidote to his own poiſon before he adminiſtered it, that it may be as uſeful to diſplay his inconſiſtency as entertaining to peruſe the

CONTRAST.

EXTRACTS FROM "THE EXAMPLE OF FRANCE, &c." PUBLISHED IN MARCH 1793, BY MR. YOUNG WHEN A GOVERNMENT PLACEMAN.

The old government of France, with all its faults, was certainly the beſt enjoyed by any conſiderable country in Europe, England alone excepted; but there were many faults in it which every claſs of people wiſhed to remedy. At the commencement of the Revolution France poſſeſſed a very flouriſhing commerce; the richeſt colonies in the world; the greateſt currency of ſolid money in Europe; her agriculture was improving; and her people, though from too great a population, much too numerous for the higheſt degrees of national proſperity, yet *were more at their eaſe* than in many other countries of Europe; *the government was regular and mild.*—*(p. 48—9 of the Example of France.)*

EXTRACTS FROM THE TRAVELS PUBLISHED IN MAY 1792, BY MR. YOUNG WHEN A FARMER UNCONNECTED WITH GOVERNMENT.

Under the old French government Lettres de cachet were carried to an exceſs hardly credible; to the length of being ſold with blanks to be filled up with names at the pleaſure of the purchaſer; who was thus able, in the gratification of private revenge, to tear a man from the boſom of his family, and bury him in a dungeon, where he would exiſt forgotten and die unknown.—*(Travels, p. 532.)*

In ſpeaking of the preſervation of the Game in the *Capitaineries*, it muſt be obſerved that by game muſt be underſtood whole droves of wild boars, and herds of deer not confined by any wall or pale, but wandering at pleaſure over the whole country to the deſtruction of crops; and to the peopling of the Gallies by the wretched peaſants who preſumed to kill them, in order to ſave that food which was to ſupport their helpleſs children. There were numerous edicts for preſerving the game, which prohibited

Such

Such is the ſtate, *(of France in January* 1793) and there are politicians in England who tell us, all will end well in France, as if it were poſſible to remedy ſuch evils by new experiments. The abſolute and unequivocal reſtoration of the Old Government, with terrors in its train, not the beneficence of Louis the XVI. ſeems now to be the only remedy. It was not thus under the old government; but they *(the People)* were not content.—*(p.* 134.)

The fate of landlords in France is too well known to want repetition; their eſtates ſeized, their *Chateaus* plundered and burnt; their wives and daughters violated; and themſelves either murdered or driven into exile.—*(p.* 116.)

The old government of France was the mildeſt and moſt benignant in Europe; our own only excepted; a government cruelly libelled in the character given by one of our reforming orators, *(Mr. Sheridan)* who thus deſcribes it: "A ſpecies of government that trampled on the property, the liberty, and the lives of its ſubjects; that dealt in extortions, dungeons and tortures; and that prepared

hibited weeding and hoeing, leſt the young partridges ſhould be diſturbed; ſteeping ſeed leſt it ſhould injure the game; manuring with night ſoil leſt the flavour of the partridges ſhould be injured by feeding on the corn ſo produced; mowing hay, &c. before a certain time, ſo late as to ſpoil many crops, and taking away the ſtubble, which would deprive the birds of ſhelter. Such were the exertions of arbitrary power which the lower orders felt directly from the Royal Authority; but heavy as they were, it is a queſtion whether the others, ſuffered circuitouſly through the Nobility and Clergy were not yet more oppreſſive.—*(p.* 535.)

The burthen of people groaning under ſo many oppreſſions united to render their ſituations ſo bad that no change could be for the worſe. The adminiſtration of juſtice was partial, venal, and infamous. Upon the queſtion of expecting juſtice to be fairly adminiſtered, every one confeſſed there was no ſuch thing to be looked for. The conduct of the Parliaments was profligate and atrocious. Upon almoſt every occaſion that came before them, intereſt was openly made with the judges; and woe betided the man who with a cauſe to ſupport had no means of conciliating favour, either by the beauty of a handſome wife, or by other methods.—*(p.* 537.)

It is impoſſible to juſtify the exceſſes of the people on taking up arms; they were certainly guilty of cruelties; it is idle to deny the facts, for they have been proved too clearly to admit of a doubt. But is it really the people to whom we are to impute the whole? Or to their oppreſſors, who had kept them ſo long in a ſtate of bondage? He who chooſes to be ſerved by ſlaves, and by ill treated ſlaves, muſt know that he holds both his property and life by a tenure far different from thoſe who prefer the ſervice of well treated freemen; and he who dines to the muſic of groaning ſufferers, muſt not in the moment of inſurrection complain that his daughters are raviſhed, and then deſtroyed; and that his ſons throats are cut. When ſuch evils happen, they ſurely are more imputable to the tyranny of the maſter than the cruelty of the ſervant. The analogy holds with the French peaſants—the murder of a Seigneur, or a Chateau in flames, is recorded in every newſpaper; the rank of the perſon who ſuffers attracts notice: but where do we find the regiſter of that Seigneur's oppreſſions of his peaſantry,

prepared before hand a day of ſanguinary vengeance."—(*p.* 33)

To impriſon whom they pleaſed, on ſuſpicion, as a method of taking off thoſe they dared not, or could not, publicly accuſe, was a convenient mode of tyranny, not unworthy of the wretch, a member of their Pandemonium, (Convention) who ſpeaking to the queſtion of trying the unhappy King, aſſigned him to torments, in the hearing of thoſe tribunes who might ſoon be the executioners of his bloody wiſhes.—(*p.* 31.)

It can hardly be doubted but that robbery, even of land itſelf, muſt ſpread throughout the kingdom of France.—(*p.* 36.)

The

ſantry, and his exactions of feudal ſervices from thoſe whoſe children were dying around them for want of bread? Where do we find the minutes that aſſigned theſe ſtarving wretches to ſome vile petty-fogger to be fleeced by impoſitions and a mockery of juſtice in the Seigneural Courts? Who has dwelt ſufficiently upon explaining all the ramifications of deſpotiſm, regal, ariſtocratical, and eccleſiaſtical, pervading the whole maſs of the people, reaching like a circulating fluid the moſt diſtant capillary tubes of poverty and wretchedneſs? In theſe caſes the ſufferers are too ignoble to be known, and the maſs too indiſcriminate to be pitied. The true judgment to be formed of the French Revolution muſt ſurely be gained from an attentive conſideration of the evils of the old government: when theſe are well underſtood—and when the extent and univerſality of the oppreſſion under which the people groaned, —oppreſſion which bore upon them from every quarter, it will ſcarcely be attempted to be urged that a revolution was not abſolutely neceſſary to the welfare of the kingdom.—(*p.* 539—40.)

All the family (*Royal Family of France*) being kept thus *cloſe priſoners*, for ſuch they are in effect, afford at *firſt view* a ſhocking ſpectacle; and is really ſo *if the act were not abſolutely neceſſary* to effect the Revolution; this I conceive to be impoſſible; *but if it were neceſſary no one can blame the people* for taking *every meaſure poſſible* to ſecure that liberty they had ſeized in the violence of a revolution. At ſuch a moment *nothing is to be condemned* but what endangers the national freedom.—(*p.* 265.)

I was here witneſs to a ſcene which made me ſmile: at no great diſtance from the *Chateau* of *Liancourt* is a piece of waſte land cloſe to the road, and belonging to the Duke. I ſaw ſome men very buſily at work upon it, hedging it in, in ſmall diviſions, levelling and digging and beſtowing much labour for ſo poor a ſpot. I aſked the ſteward if he thought that land worth ſuch an expence? He replied, that the poor people in the town, upon the Revolution taking place, *declared that the poor were the nation*; *that the waſte belonged to the nation*; and proceeding from *theory* to *practice*, took poſſeſſion without any further authority, and began to cultivate; the Duke not viewing

The agriculture of France is fast ſinking; her farmers, the ſlaves of all; and her people ſtarving; her manufactures annihilated; her commerce deſtroyed; her gold and ſilver diſappeared, and her currency paper ſo depreciated that it advances with rapid ſtrides to the entire ſtagnation of every ſpecies of induſtry and circulation. —(*p.* 49.)

Of the French Conſtitution we may ſay with truth and moderation, that it has brought more *miſery*, *poverty*, devaſtation, impriſonment, bloodſhed and ruin on France in *four years*, (*Mr. Young*'s *Travels were publiſhed only* TEN MONTHS *before this*) than the old government did in a century.—(*p.* 21.)

The experiment is now made on the French government; we have ſeen the reſult; it has failed totally and completely. —(*p.* 56.) The experiment of the new govern-

ing their induſtry] with any diſpleaſure, would offer no oppoſition to it. This circumſtance ſhews the univerſal ſpirit that is gone forth, and proves, that were it puſhed a little further, it might prove a ſerious matter for all the property in the kingdom. In this caſe, however, *I cannot but commend it*; for if there be one public nuiſance greater than another, it is a man preſerving the poſſeſſion of waſte land, which he will neither cultivate nor let others cultivate. The miſerable people die for want of bread in ſight of waſtes that would feed thouſands. I think them wiſe and rational, and philoſophical *in ſeizing ſuch tracks:* and I heartily wiſh there was a law in England for making this action of the French peaſants a legal one with us. —(*p.* 267.)

January 7th, 1792, the price of wheat at Paris was 22 to 28 livres, with aſſignats at 36 per cent. diſcount, a remarkable proof that the *moſt depreciated* paper currency will anſwer every purpoſe for objects of phyſical neceſſity, and daily conſumption. The very circumſtance, which, according to common ideas, ſhould have continued the depreſſion of commerce and manufactures, has moſt unaccountably revived them in ſome meaſure; I mean the depreciation of the aſſignats —(*p.* 557).

The fall of the revenue of 175 millions was not a loſs of that ſum: the loſs to the people could not be more than from 5 to 10 per cent. But was it a loſs to the miſerable ſubjects who formerly paid thoſe taxes; and who paid them by the ſweat of their brows, at the expence of their bread out of the children's mouths, aſſeſſed with tyranny and levied in blood? Is not ſuch a change eaſe, *wealth*, *life*, and *animation* to thoſe claſſes, who, while the pens of political ſatiriſts ſlander all innovations, are every moment reviving by inheriting from that revolution ſomething which the old government aſſuredly did not give? Go to the ariſtocratic politician at Paris or at London, and you will hear only of the ruin of France—go to the cottage of the *Metayer*, or the houſe of the farmer, and demand of him what the reſult has been—there will be but one voice from Calais to Bayonne.——(*p.* 546.)

It is experience alone and *long experience* that can ſatisfy the doubts which every one muſt entertain on this ſubject, (*the new French government.*) What can we know expe-

government in France was complete—it was finiſhed, decreed, and accepted. It could not go on, it was rotten at the heart. —(*p.* 170.)

Of what is the preſent Convention of France compoſed? Of the loweſt, pooreſt, moſt profligate, and moſt worthleſs of the people—of the ſcum of goals, of their gallies, and of their hulks—of robbers and cut-throats! What is Condorcet, Paine, Briſſot, Rabeau?—(*p.* 101.)

The cities of France are ſcenes of revolt, maſſacre, and famine; and her provinces plundered by gangs of banditti. Her future proſpect of peace and ſettlement depending on a conſtitution that is to be formed by a Convention of Rabble, and ſanctioned by the *Sans Culottes* of the Kennel. It is not a few inſulated crimes on ſome undeſerving men; it i a ſeries of horrid proſcription, ſpreading far and near; pervading every quarter of the kingdom; it is the annihilation of rank, of right, of property; it is the legiſlation of wolves that govern only in deſtruction: and all theſe maſſacres and plunderings, and burnings, and horrors of every denomination, are ſo far from being neceſſary for the eſtabliſhment of liberty that they have effectually deſtroyed it. In one word, France is abſolutely without government; anarchy reigns; the poinard and the pike of the mob give the law to all that once formed the higher claſſes, and to all that at preſent mocks with the ſhew of legiſlation.—(*p.* 50)

It is not Roberſpierre and Egalité that have murdered Louis; it was Neckar, with his *double Tiers*. And ſhould ever ſimilar deeds again blot the national character of this kingdom, it is not the wretches who ſhall form ſome diſtant convention of anarchy to whom the miſchief ſhould be attributed, but to our reformers; to our Jacobin advocates, for *improving* our repreſentation.—(*p.* 100)

It is not the rank Jacobin, with bare and bloody arms, pike in hand, and ready for your throat; it is his gentleman uſher, your modeſt reformer, who meaning a great deal, aſks a little, and knows how to make that little much. But be not cajoled—*reſiſt* ALL CHANGES in that conſtitution which gives you the means of wealth and protects you in the enjoyment.—(*p.* 148.)

In regard to the future conſequences of this ſingular revolution as an example to other nations, there can be no doubt but the ſpirit which has produced it will ſooner or later ſpread throughout Europe, according to the different degrees of illumination amongst the common people; and it will prove either miſchievous or beneficial in proportion to the previous steps taken by governments. Revolutions in other countries will be blown up from riotous mobs from the military called out to quell them, but refuſing obedience, and joining the inſurgents. Such a flame ſpreading rapidly through a country, muſt prove more hoſtile and more fatal to property than any thing that has prevailed in France. The probability of ſuch events is not inconſiderable; they would produce not a national aſſembly, and a free conſtitution, but an univerſal anarchy and confuſion. Can there be ſo much ſupineneſs in the preſent governments of Europe as to ſuppoſe that old principles and maxims will avail any longer? Can ſuch ignorance of the human heart, and ſuch blindneſs to the natural courſe of

experimentally of a government which has not ſtood the brunt of unſucceſsful and ſucceſsful wars?—(*p.* 548.) The experiment is not made on the American government.—(*p.* 556.)

The groſs abuſe which has been thrown on the French nation, and particularly on their aſſemblies, in certain pamphlets, and without interruption, in ſeveral of our newſpapers, ought to be deprecated by every man who feels for the future intereſts of this country. It is in ſome inſtances carried to ſo ſcandalous an exceſs, that we muſt neceſſarily give extreme diſguſt to thouſands of people, who may hereafter have an ample opportunity to *vote* and *act* under influence of impreſſions unfavourable towards a country, that, unprovoked, has loaded them with ſo much contumely; for a nation groaning under a debt of 240 millions, that deadens the very idea of future energy, this ſeems, to uſe the mildeſt language, to be at leaſt very imprudent.—(*p.* 556.)

events

In comparing the Engliſh Conſtitution to a machine which has gone well for an hundred years, perhaps it is indifferent whether *influence* (which reformers call corruption, and they might call it adultery with as much truth) be termed the *oil* or the *duſt* of the machine, for if it has gone well for a century, and ſeems while certain wheels are half covered with duſt, to go better than formerly, I would no more allow the duſt to be bruſhed away than I would permit the oil to be removed. Influence however, is not the duſt but the oil of the machine. The Conſtitution never went for a moment without influence; and to remove it, would be taking away the oil which has given a century of ſmoothneſs.—(*p.* 112.)

Nations ſhould proceed as individuals; rely only on experimented caſes. When philoſophers adviſed the French to ſeek ſome ſyſtem of freedom better than experiment (Great Britain) offered, they adviſed a truſt in theory; and at this moment, when jacobins and reformiſts adviſe us to improve our conſtitution, is it not a queſtion directly in point to aſk them, whether the experimented freedom we enjoy at preſent ought to be hazarded on projects of theory? An unequal repreſentation, rotten boroughs, long parliaments, extravagant courts, ſelfiſh miniſters, and corrupt majorities, are ſo intimately interwoven with our practical freedom, that it would require better political anatomiſts than our modern reformers, to ſhew, on fact, that we did not owe our liberty to the identical evils which they want to expunge—(*p.* 171.)

events be found, *as the plan of rejecting all innovations leſt they ſhould lead to greater.*—(*p.* 549.) The means of making a government reſpected and beloved, are, in England, taxes muſt be immenſely reduced; aſſeſſments on malt, leather, candles, ſoap, ſalt, and windows, muſt be aboliſhed or lightened; the funding ſyſtem, the parent of taxation, annihilated for ever, by taxing the interest of the public debt; tythes and teſts aboliſhed; *the repreſentation of parliament* REFORMED, *and its duration ſhortened*, not to give the people without property a predominancy, but to prevent that *corruption* in which our debts and taxes have originated; the utter deſtruction of all monopolies, and among them of all charters and corporations; game made property, and belonging to the poſſeſſor of one acre as much as to him who has a thouſand; and laſtly, the laws both civil and criminal to be thoroughly reformed. Theſe circumſtances include the great evils of the Britiſh conſtitution; if they be remedied it may enjoy even a Venetian longivity; but if they be allowed, like cancerous humours, to prey on the nobler parts of the political ſyſtem, this boaſted fabric may not exiſt even twenty years.—(*p.* 550.)

The abuſes that are rooted in all the old governments of Europe, give ſuch numbers of men a direct intereſt in ſupporting, cheriſhing, and defending abuſes, that no wonder advocates for tyranny of every ſpecies are found in every country, and almoſt in every company. What a maſs of people in every part of England, are, ſome way or other, intereſted in the preſent repreſentation of the people, tythes, charters, corporations, monopolies, and taxation! And not merely to the things themſelves, but to all the abuſes attending them; and how many are there who derive *their profit, or their conſideration in life*, not merely from ſuch inſtitutions, but from the evils they engender! The great maſs of the people, however, is free from ſuch influence, and will be enlightened by degrees; aſſuredly they will find out, in every country in Europe, that by combinations on the principles of liberty and property, aimed equally againſt regal, ariſtocratical, and mobbiſh tyranny, they will be able to reſiſt ſucceſsfully, that variety of combination, which, on principles of plunder and deſpotiſm, is every where at work to enſlave them.—(*p.* 540.)

All but jacobins admit that with this ſyſtem of *influence*, which ſeems corruption in the eye of ignorance, the liberties of the (Engliſh) people have been, to the preſent hour, conſtantly improving; and for a century paſt have very far exceeded any other ſyſtem of freedom the world ever ſaw. If *influence* were as miſchievous as ſome viſionaries would make us believe, how could this be ſo? We are *happy* under the government of influence, how then can it be bad?—*(p.* 83.)

The Crown and the Barons laid the foundation of that, which, at the revolution, was by the nobility matured into the preſent (Engliſh) conſtitution; by making the conſtitution they made all the conſtitution has generated; that is wealth, felicity, the people, the nation. By making liberty, they made Engliſhmen—Nurſed their infancy, eſtabliſhed their manhood. By giving the bleſſings of a good government, they gradually produced a great, a happy, and a free nation.—*(p.* 205.)

Thus it is with reports of committees of our "Friends (of the People)." You ſtate, that, in the conſtitution of England, two thouſand ſix hundred perſons return three hundred and twenty members—You ſtate a fact; but do you prove that fact an evil? We feel that we are free under this conſtitution. — We know that Engliſh practice is good: what inducement have we, therefore, to liſten to your ſpeculations that condemn what *all England feels to be good.* —*(p.* 85.)

If France ſhould ever again poſſeſs the precious moment of improving her government without convulſions, which opportunity ſhe had, and loſt; or if any other great country, having an indigent poor, ſhould meet ſuch a moment—*Experiment* ſpeaks to them but one language—Take the Britiſh conſtitution, not becauſe it is theo-

May there not come the danger of an ariſtocracy uniting with the crown againſt the people? That is to ſay, *influencing*, by weight of property and power, a great maſs of the people dependent, againſt the rest of the people who are independent? Do we not ſee this to be very much the caſe in England at this moment? To what other part of our conſtitution is it imputable that we have been infamouſly involved in perpetual wars from which none reap any benefit, but that tribe of vermin which thrive most when a nation most declines: contractors, victuallers, paymasters, ſtock-jobbers, and money ſcriveners, a ſet by whom miniſters are ſurrounded; and in favour of whom *whole claſſes of people are beggared and ruined.* Thoſe who aſſert a conſtitution can be good which ſuffers thoſe things, ought at least to agree, that ſuch a one as would not ſuffer them would be much better.—*(p.* 547.)

The Engliſh conſtitution ought not to be allowed even tolerable, for this plain reaſon, ſuch public extravagance engenders taxes to an amount that will ſooner or later force the people into reſiſtance, which is always the deſtruction of a conſtitution; and ſurely that muſt be admitted bad, which carries to the most careleſs eye the ſeeds of its own deſtruction. Two hundered and forty millions of public debt in a century, is a ratio impoſſible to be ſupported; and therefore evidently ruinous.—*(p.* 547.)

Probably the American government will always be found excellent; but we have no conviction, no proof; it is in the womb of time. The experiment is not made. Such remarks, however, ought always to be accompanied with the admiſſion, that the Britiſh government has been experimented.—With what reſult? Let a debt of two hundred and forty millions—Let ſeven wars—Let Bengal and Gibraltar—Let thirty millions ſterling of national burthens, taxes, rates, tythes, and monopolies—Let theſe anſwer.—*(p.* 556.)

What can we know experimentally of a government which has not ſtood the brunt of unſucceſsful and ſucceſsful wars? The Engliſh conſtitution has ſtood this teſt, and has been found deficient; or rather as far as this teſt can decide any thing, has been proved worthleſs; ſince in a ſingle century it has involved the nation in a debt of ſo vaſt a magnitude, that every bleſſing, which might have been otherwiſe perpetuated,

theoretically the best, *but because it is practically good.*—(*p.* 178.)

ated, is put to the stake; so that if the nation do not make some change in its constitution, it is much to be dreaded that the constitution will ruin the nation. Where *practice* and *experience have so utterly failed*, it would be in vain to reason from theory.—(*p.* 548.) The national debt, and our enormous taxation are the best answer the National Assembly gives to those who would have had the English government with all its faults on its head, adopted in France; nor was it without reason, said by a popular writer, that a government, formed like the English, obtains more revenue than it could do, either by direct despotism, or in a full state of freedom.—(*p.* 548.)

These extracts need no comment; they are of themselves a sufficient answer to Mr. Young's pamphlet; and they shew the extraordinary change which may be effected in some men's political sentiments by a good salary from Government. Our alarmists have indeed rendered their fears a source of great pecuniary profit. This is a circumstance too, in which, by their own account, they imitate the objects of their aversion, the ruling men in France. They contend, that the members of the Convention are avaricious and corrupt, and if this be true, the avarice and corruption of our Tories may possibly proceed from the spirit of imitation, which we find so prevalent among the English alarmist-Ministers, and their foreign Allies, that our own, and the other governments of Europe, seem to have discovered much that is worthy of imitation in the conduct of the unanointed Executive Council. For if the French affiliated Brabant by the point of the sword, have not the Allies bullied, insulted, dragooned, every neutral power? Sweden, Denmark, Venice, Switzerland, Tuscany, and Genoa, have had their independence violated. I dare not, indeed, speak in adequate terms of the conduct pursued with the two latter states, whose towns were threatened, with tolerable plainness, to be given up to "military execution," if they did not declare War against

against France! Is there no resemblance to be found between the decree of the 19th of November, and the conduct of our Generals and Admirals in the West Indies and Toulon, where they have offered *assistance* and *fraternity* to all Frenchmen who would renounce obedience to the mother country, and accept of TRUE liberty, as modelled by those who have just bestowed it on Poland? The more the proceedings of the Belligerent Powers are examined, the more it will be found that France, which formerly set the fashions of dress, now sets the fashions of government over Europe; and that the people of England in particular, have adopted their political conduct, with more eagerness, than ever they adopted the stile of a cap or a coat *. The objects, indeed, are different; but the means taken to obtain or secure those objects, and which alone excite indignation, are the *very same*:—Nay, the objects of the French people, the establishment of the Liberties, the Peace, and the Happiness of Mankind, are *good*, admitting the means to be bad: But the objects of the Tory Jacobins, perpetuating the ignorance of the poor, arming the rich against the poor; the suppression of the Freedom of Speech, and the Liberty of the Press,

* It would be endless to enumerate the instances wherein the French have taken some extraordinary and violent measures, which first have been reprobated, and then imitated by the Allies. The ordering of the People to rise in a mass is a curious one. That mode of recruiting was execrated as tyrannical, not only in Britain, but throughout Europe; and at the very time, the 21st of January, that Lord Mornington was making a laborious speech shewing how *oppressive* it was, and how *unsound* it must render their armies, the German Empire comes forward, and says, as the French have beaten us by rising in a mass, so we must adopt the same *infamous* means to beat them in our turn:—They therefore order the Circles on the Frontier to rise in a mass, and the British Ministry soon afterwards do nearly the same thing in the Maritime Counties at home;—These *oppressive unsound* proceedings of the French become *equitable* and *sound*, it seems, when adopted by her enemies!

together

together with the justification of every vice of government, are *bad*, and their means are *equally bad* also.

It will be found, upon a candid examination of facts, that instead of the crimes which have disgraced France, being the consequence of her principles, they have been produced and wilfully instigated by the German Princes, in hopes of rendering odious those very principles, as they dreaded that their establishment in France would ultimately destroy all tyrannical governments in Europe. The French were by no means the authors of the present War; on the contrary, they did all in their power to prevent it.

It was the Courts of Austria and Berlin, and a few profligate emigrants, who provoked the rupture which has now involved Europe in calamity. France confined herself within her own territories, and to her own domestic concerns, till she was exasperated by a combination against a government recently settled, approved by her inhabitants, and which promised to establish a peaceable and lasting limited monarchy. Before the ferment of the first Revolution was allayed, and the dregs it had stirred up were sunk to their proper level, the King, by his flight, proved his connection with the Princes who were plotting against the Constitution. Their hostile intrigues at foreign courts became too manifest and provoking: they deserted their country to procure its invasion, and left the field completely in possession of the Republican Party, whose credit they strengthened by their own treachery, and taught the people to believe the Nobles naturally and irrevocably their enemies; and, to conclude, that security for their Liberties was to be looked for in their own interference and activity, rather than in the generosity or justice of the higher ranks of society.

In September 1791, the manifesto from Monsieur and the Comte d'Artois to the King of France, announced

nounced their success in persuading the Emperor and the King of the Prussia to hostility against the new Constitution: and those Monarchs gave it under their hands, signed at Pilnitz, that they required all the powers in Europe to assist them in this War, for "the Rights of Sovereigns." The Princes also affirmed, that "the *other* European Courts had the same "dispositions with those of Vienna and Berlin."--- The speedy confirmation of what they had asserted, respecting the Emperor and King of Prussia, procured belief to the other passages of their declaration, particularly as they remained uncontradicted by those to whom they made allusion; and it was necessarily concluded, that all courts, and even that of St. James's, wished well to the Concert of Princes. But how did France act in this situation?---Not like England last winter. She did not precipitate herself into a War, although provoked by the most flagrant violation of the Rights of Nations*. She negociated; ---for eight months she negociated---till finding it impossible to obtain either satisfaction or explanation for the Pilnitz Conspiracy, and that the Despots of Germany were resolved on hostilities, and were only delaying their commencement till fully prepared, she submitted to inevitable compulsion; and to shew that she was not dismayed or terrified, she declared War, which on her part was indisputably *defensive by anticipation*. But notwithstanding hostilities had been effectually communicated by the Emperor and King of Prussia, in August 1791, and she did not resolve on a rupture till the April following, many persons have

* The Imperial Minister Kaunitz on the 18th of March 1792, after reviling the French Constitution, and refusing to disperse the armies collected on the Frontiers of France, threatened to appeal from the Government to the *sound* and *principal* part of the Nation. (See Debrett's State Papers.) It was that insolent outrageous Note, and the refusal of any explanation respecting its allusions that produced the Declaration of War by France.

had

had the effrontery and folly to assert, that France invited the War*!

It is neither to their new principles, nor the natural cruelty of the French, that we are to ascribe the atrocities which have lately disgraced that nation. It might as truly be said, that the principles of the Protestant Religion inculcate murder and rapine, because such

* The following Extract is unquestionable proof of the wicked designs of the German Princes. It clearly establishes that which is here maintained, viz. that the continental Despots were the aggressors in the present War. It gives reason to suspect, that the King of France, designed by his flight, to put himself at the head of the invaders, as it shews, that long before his attempt to escape, he knew of the plot, yet concealed it; and it completely refutes the assertion in a late Pamphlet entitled, "Reflections on the propriety of an immediate Peace," (written by Mr. Vansittart) that the Convention at Pilnitz, was only formed in consequence of the imprisonment of Louis; and that when he was set at liberty, it ceased to exist, because, it shews, that the plot against France, was formed when the King enjoyed more indulgence than at any other period during the Revolution, and when the new Constitution wore the most auspicious aspect. M. Bigot de Sainte Croix, who was Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Louis the XVIth. at the time that Monarch was dethroned, and who is now an emigrant, in London, has, since his arrival here, published a History of the Conspiracy of the 10th of August, in which he says, p. 152, "Dès le *Printems* de 1791, le "Roi empêchoit l'execution d'un plan secret arrêtè a Mantoue "pour attaquer, deux mois après, la France, dont les armées etoient "alors incomplettes, et les frontiéres sans defense."

"In the spring of 1791, the King prevented the execution of a "secret plan, determined on at Mantua, for attacking France two "months afterwards, the armies of which were then incomplete, and "the frontiers defenceless."

This gentleman's authority is of the highest nature. He now avows himself always to have been a determined Royalist. With a laudable love of his King, however, he thought he could most sincerely serve him by disguising his sentiments, and remaining about his person, which he did as long as it was safe to do so. He was a particular confident of Louis the XVIth. and he now abuses the Constitution of 1789. But what is stronger proof of his being a Royalist, and a confidant of his late King, is, that he is admitted to St. James's, and caressed by our Government; and, even the well known Peltier, in his Dernier Tableau de Paris, calls him "le veri-"table homme du Roi."

doctrines

doctrines have lately been recommended from the pulpit; or that they produced the riots in 1780, as that the Principles of Liberty which have animated the French are the cause of the crimes committed in that Country It is to the foreign combination against the people, and the resistance of the rich to the establishment of their Liberties at home;---"It "was that hateful outrage on the rights and feelings "of human nature, that wretched tissue of pride, "folly and inhumanity; it was the Duke of Brunswick's Manifesto that first steeled the heart and "maddened the brain of all France; which provoked "those it had devoted, to practise all the cruelties it "had impotenly threatened to inflict; which sharpened the daggers of the assassins of the 2d of September, and whetted the axe suspended over the "unfortunate Monarch *." That infamous manifesto produced the 10th of august; and aided by the treacherous surrender of Longwy, it provoked the horrid massacres of the 2d of September; the inevitable War with Britain and Holland hurried the unfortunate Louis to the scaffold; and the loss of Valenciennes proved the forerunner of the trial, and the delivery of Toulon the signal for the execution of the Queen. The success of the Combined Powers has invariably produced the reverse of their professed object; it has always made more enthusiasts, united the people more firmly, and removed the prospect of re-establishing Monarchy and Nobility to a greater distance. Since all Europe has joined in the cry of erasing France from the list of nations, she has only retaliated by vowing the destruction of all Despotic Governments. The monsters of France have been begotten by the monsters of Germany. The Duke of Brunswick first taught them proscription and murder; their only choice was, whether they should

* *Vide* Mr. Sheridan's Speech, Dec. 15, 1792.

assassinate

assassinate or be assassinated ;—whether the Duke of Brunswick should preside over another St. Bartholomew, or Marat over a 2d of September.

We shuddered at the news of the 2d of September, yet the *merciful* doctrines preached at home did not even excite a murmur. On the Royal-Exchange, the gallows was openly talked of, as necessary to extirpate the favourers of Peace and Reform. If then, Englishmen, by a false alarm, could be guilty of wishing for the blood of persons whose only crime was difference of opinion, why should we condemn the French, in whom every evil has been realized, which here was only dreaded? If Englishmen, merely because they were *told* they were in danger, could endure such sanguinary language, what might not have been their excesses if some of the principal personages in the kingdom had brought an hundred thousand German robbers to destroy our valued Constitution and establish Despotism? If they had taken possession of Yarmouth and Norwich, and threatened to give up the City of London to "military execution," what mad or wicked theorist might not then have been listened to? Mr. Young, by warning Britain against the example of France, does in fact acknowledge, that in similar circumstances, Englishmen would be guilty of similar enormities. If they would not, what occasion is there for *warning* them? The inhabitants of France are not naturally more cruel than those of this country, and were the enemies of that nation to cease to goad and exasperate her by their forces without, and their treacherous and incendiary agents within, a fair experiment might then be made on the undisturbed operation of French principles; it might then be seen, that from the forced state in which France is held by the confederacy of Despots, arise those crimes, and that impunity, which have been falsely and wickedly ascribed to the Principles of Liberty. She might then, indeed,

indeed be an example, instead of a warning to other nations: and nobody foresaw this more clearly than the Despots themselves; for when the Constituent Assembly declared in favour of a pacific system, against conquest or offensive War, the whole fraternity on the continent were alarmed for their trade. Abolish War! Abolish the means of gratifying our ambition, of plundering our subjects, and perpetuating our tyranny!—Abolish War!—Then we must make War on you to prevent it. We will give a stab to your pacific system in its infancy, and, by driving you into excesses and horrors, convince the world that War, our Trade, is necessary to the happiness of Society.

I cannot close the whole subject of the War between France and the other Continental Powers better than by quoting what Lord Mornington said in the House of Commons, May 7, 1793, of the War in which England was engaged immediately after the Revolution of 1688: his words may very justly be applied to the present contest, if instead of Louis XIV, we read the Triumvirate, the Empress of Russia, the Emperor of Germany, and the King of Prussia. "The Wars "which immediately followed the Revolution," (said his Lordship,) "were absolutely necessary for the "security of that auspicious settlement. The recent "establishment required protection, not only against "the abdicated King, and those who supported his "cause at home, or who had followed his fortunes "abroad, but also against the pride and jealousy of "Louis XIV. *He could not suffer a LIMITED* MO-"NARCHY, *FOUNDED* ON THE LIBERTIES OF THE PEO-"PLE, to grow up and flourish *in peace* so near his "Throne. He naturally foresaw that such a Consti-"tution must become a *continual reproach* to the ty-"ranny of his government, and an insuperable ob-"stacle to the progress of his ambition. It was, "therefore, his policy to attempt the destruction of

" so formidable a neighbour, by every means, both " of open force, and *secret machination.*"

Next to the crimes committed in France, which have artfully been misrepresented to be the consequence of French Principles, the word *Equality* has been falsely deemed to mean an Agrarian Law: thus at once exciting horror, and creating an alarm for property. Mr. Reeves, in the publication already alluded to, says, Equality means, that all men shall be equally tall, equally wise, and equally strong, as well as equally rich. This may be fit for Mr. Reeves to say, but not for me to answer. I do not doubt, however, of its having prejudiced the vulgar, who would naturally believe the French could be guilty of any thing, after being gravely told, that they had roasted alive, basted with oil, and eaten many of the Swiss and Nobles; that others they had made into pies, and cried them about the streets*; and that they " were drunk with the blood of their fellow citizens.†" Mr. Young makes a better use, for the Tory Jacobins, of the word Equality, by construing it to mean an equalization of property; " for (says he) that all " were equal in the eye of the law, was decreed by " the Constituent Assembly, and why call the year " 1792 the fourth of Liberty and first of Equality?" —All were not equal in the eye of the law by the decree alluded to, or even previous to the 10th of August. One whole branch of the Legislature, the King, was above the law; and although I am ready to admit that it was childish to make the distinction in dating the year, yet, when I find some reason for it, and none in support of Mr. Young's assertion, that " Property was glanced at," I think it is proper to take that reason, however small, as the fair explanation, rather than put a construction upon the word

* Vide the accounts of the transactions on the 10th of August, published soon after that day in the Times.

† Vide Bishop of Gloucester's Sermon.

which

which no circumstance justifies, merely because Mr. Young asserts "it either meant that (equalization of "property) or it meant nothing;" because he acknowledges not to understand it, shall we receive as fact that which he wishes, and therefore supposes it to mean? As the King was not amenable to the law, strictly speaking, there could not be perfect Equality. On the question of Royal Inviolability, however, I give no opinion.

It is not necessary to say much in answer to the common misrepresentations of Equality. No candid intelligent man, either in France or England, could ever understand it to mean otherwise than an equality of responsibility to, and protection from the law; and of this no nation in the world was ever more in want than France, previous to the Revolution in 1789. The expence of law-suits constitutes the only grievous inequality in England. It is impossible for a poor man, with his own means, to obtain redress by a course of law in this country*; and even a prudent man of small fortune will submit to an injury, rather than risk his ruin by entering into a contest with a wealthy litigious opponent. Many an instance of injustice, accomplished and maintained by riches, may be found in the Memoirs of a northern Nobleman, who has long been the tyrannical oppressor and plunderer of the poor and middling classes in that part of the kingdom which is cursed with his residence.

* It has been said, even from the Bench, that our laws are equally open to the poor as to the rich, because if a man cannot fee an advocate, the court will provide him one gratis. This, like some other parts of our Constitution, was excellently intended, and, no doubt, at its first institution, proved highly beneficial; but, like many more institutions, Time, that great innovator, has reduced it to a mere shadow. The fee of a counsellor is the least expence of a law-suit; nor can his services be of much utility to his client, if he is unacquainted with his case, till after the trial has begun; and even then most probably he cannot, from the ignorance of the poor man, rightly understand it.

It is

It is to what *he calls* the French Equality, that Mr. Young ascribes a system of rapine and plunder, which he affirms exists in that nation. He concludes a number of his paragraphs with "This is Equality! "Rob the farmer! Plunder the land-holder and di- "vide his land! Equality of property! An Agrarian "Law, &c. According to French Principles, the "first beggar I meet, may, sabre in one hand, Rights "of Man in the other, demand a share of what is my "own, my property, my land at Bradfield." And in this manner he proceeds, arguing, as if an equalization of property had actually taken place in France; or at least, as if some notorious and undeniable proofs had occurred of robbing a man of his estate, and dividing it among "Beggars."

The only instance, however, which he attempts to produce in support of this, (and if more or better could have been found, he has shewn so much industry in collecting the crimes of the French, that he certainly would have brought them forward) is, an unathenticated one in the Clermontois, where an estate was seized from the proprietor, who was, no doubt, an emigrant, as Mr. Young owns, "*he lived at a dis-* "*tance*"; and where some of the tenants, who talked of retaining their farms, because those who laboured should not pay money to those who did nothing, were, most probably for so doing, obliged to quit, and the property was ultimately held in trust for the nation. But this story rests wholly on Mr. Young's bare assertion, who has not quoted even the authority of a newspaper, which he invariably does on all other occasions; and whether it is true or false is immaterial, because it proves nothing like a general principle of equalizing property. In the present state of France, no doubt, many atrocious robberies are committed, which would be punished or prevented, if the German plunderers would allow the government to act, as it certainly would do in tranquillity, with rigorous justice.

justice. In any country, in a similar situation, similar crimes would be perpetrated; and, at all events, they can have no connection with the principles of Liberty and Equality.—Because the Northern Lord, to whom I have just alluded, has, by dint of wealth, plundered every man in his neighbourhood who had any thing to lose, are we therefore to conclude it to be a principle in the English law, that the rich may rob the poor?

Instances, and strongly authenticated Instances, to confute Mr. Young's assertions respecting an Agrarian Law are on record, and cannot be denied. About the very time he was writing his book, when all the horrors and anarchy on which he continually rings were reigning, the Duc de Penthievre died, where he had long lived, in the heart of France. He possessed immense wealth, both in land and moveables; was the Father-in-law, but enemy, of the Duke of Orleans, from whom his daughter had been long separated; and he was even supposed to be unfriendly to the Revolution. He was an amiable and beloved man; he never interfered in politics; amidst every violence and change, his property and person were untouched, and many a poor man's tear bedewed his grave! No beggar, sabre in hand, demanded a share of his property, either during his life or at his death. Here, then, is a direct notorious proof that the property even of an *eminent nobleman* is not violated, while he does not oppose the existing government; and undoubtedly every man, who conducted himself like the Duc de Penthievre, was equally unmolested. It was incumbent on Mr. Young to give proofs that men had been plundered in France for no other offence than that of being rich, before he pretended to be ruled by "Events" which never took place, to be guided by "Experiments" which never

never were made, and to follow a "Practice†" which had never any existence but in his own credulity or misrepresentation.

It is, however, highly probable, that the French Government, since it has no ally to pay the expences of defending its own territories, and is so hemmed in and insulated by its enemies, that it cannot borrow, will be obliged to have recourse to some extraordinary measures which may be no further justifiable than on the hackneyed plea, so often used by its present invaders, "State necessity!" But whatever may be done in the present ferment and alarm, when France, instead of following strict justice, has no struggle for her very existence as an independent nation, will be no proof that she would not have been, if permitted to remain in peace, and yet will be, when peace is restored to her, as equitable as her neighbours. Should the government seize a part of the effects of the wealthy for the defence of the country, that will give no more reason to expect an Agrarian Law, than raising twenty Millions annually in Britain gives reason to expect it will be afterwards equally divided among the people. Mr. Young well knew that there is a decree making it death to propose an Agrarian Law, which has long been and still is in *full force*; but it

† It is rather curious, that while Mr. Young is continually comparing Government with Farming, and asking, what wise Farmer would try theory, while there is good practice to guide him? that he himself should be attempting the most absurd theories, in the teeth of the best practice. Since the publication of his Pamphlet, he has *speculated* in a new-fangled *Theory* for the improvement of wool: he had waistcoats fastened round his sheep, that, when turned into the fields, were so terrified at the appearance of each other, that they separated with the greatest precipitation and alarm; tore their waistcoats off in running through the hedges, and scattered themselves in such a manner over the country, that it was with great difficulty they could be recovered. This circumstance exposes Mr. Young's sincerity and consistency, in condemning new experiments when we have a good old practice to go by.

it did not suit his imposition to notice it. Whatever may be done in France, ought not to be ascribed to the principles or rapacity of the people, but to the unparalelled exigency of the times. To support her Liberties, indeed, the rich will probably be forced to pay what the poor cannot; and to this Mr. Young will not object, as he admits, p. 123, "In taxation, "speaking at large of a nation, the quantum *paid* is "not so much the object to regard, as the quantum "*left* after the taxes are paid."

But while I deny that any thing like proof can be produced of an Agrarian Law having taken place in France, I own that an extensive and awful confiscation has been made.! What has been the occasion of it?—Not a desire to plunder and divide Property. It has been the folly, weakness, or wickedness of those who have suffered, some of whom openly declared against the Constitution, and excited the invasion of the Country; others had made their hostile disposition too manifest to be safe at home, therefore they fled; and the ruling power in Paris, finding the Emigrants were drawing out the wealth of the nation in order to make War upon it, seized the estates of all those who did not appear within a limited time. Such as were friendly to the Constitution could have no objection to appear at their post, because they were in no danger; and those whose hostility was ascertained by their absence, deserved to lose their property;—deserved to lose it on the principles of the British Government, which seized the property of the Rebels in 1715 and 1745, as greedily as the French Convention; and whose tremendous confiscations in Ireland during the Commonwealth, (afterwards *confirmed* by Charles the IId.) and in the reign of William the IIId. surpass all that has hitherto been done in France; where, if men's minds were restored to tranquillity by peace, and their country secure, the vengeance of enthusiastic

fury

fury would assuage, and probably most of the fugitives would be reinstated in their ancient inheritance and sequestered property.

Besides general pictures of French excesses, and misconstructions of the word Equality, Mr. Young continually maintains "Experiment," "Practice," and "Events," to be the only wise rule of conduct; and, alluding to the experiment of personal representation being attempted in France, (for I deny that it has been made)—he says, (p. 56) "The thing is "tried; that method of drilling has been experiment-"ed, and found good for nothing; the crop did not an-"swer." But if two neighbouring farmers were to try a new theory, and the children of the one were to drive beasts into their father's field, to nip the first shoots, to trample and destroy the corn as it sprung from the earth, and his crop did not answer; while that of the other farmer, whose field was unmolested, yielded an abundance beyond all expectation, could it, in such a case, be justly said the experiment failed? The farmers are France and America; the children are the Emigrants, and the beasts are the Germans. The experiment of Representative Government has not been allowed a sufficient period to be made in France, for even if the field had been unmolested, the corn has not had time to vegetate, much less to fill and ripen. In America, the field was as much disturbed, during several years, as in France, and accordingly produced nothing but weeds. But the theory was known to be good; it was persisted in, and when fair play was given to the soil, the crop was astonishing. So it will be with France, which at present, in respect to Government, may be called a neglected or barren soil; for there is a more important duty than cultivating the field; the natives must defend it, or they will have no field to cultivate.

But, says Mr. Young, the experiment has not finally been tried in America. No! Eighteen years is no experiment

experiment in America, though six months is a compleat experiment in France! "But America has such "a plenty of land that she has no poor; it is not her "Representative Government that prevents there be-"ing any poor, but it is the plenty of land. When she "has a numerous indigent poor, her Government "will tumble to pieces; the mob will not possess the "Sovereign authority and remain hungry," continues he. I deny that it is her extent of territory alone that prevents her being burthened with a numerous indigent poor. Look at almost every country in Europe, not even excepting Britain and Ireland, and acres enough will be found to make those who are now poor as comfortable as the American farmer—I do not mean by an Agrarian Law; I mean by properly employing the waste unoccupied lands. Look at the vast tracts in Germany, Hungary, and eastward towards the Black Sea, whose native fertility is doomed, by a barbarous policy, to feed wild beasts instead of man; where whole countries, that would render millions happy, are made a blank on the earth by the restless desolating ambition of bad Governments, or perhaps, to afford amusement to one Tyrant. In Spain, the example of pride and indolence in the Nobles, has occasioned such a contempt and neglect of Agriculture in the lower classes of society who ought to attend to it, that population has decreased, and the nation become insignificant in the scale of Europe compared with what it formerly was. The natives live chiefly on the natural productions of the soil, one of the richest in the world, which, if properly cultivated, might maintain, in greater plenty than at present, six times the number of inhabitants. "The extent of "ground is of so little value *without labour*," says Mr. Locke, "That I have heard it affirmed, that in "Spain itself, a man may be permitted to plough, "sow, and reap, without being disturbed, upon land "he has no other title to, but only his making use of

" it. But on the contrary, the inhabitants think " themselves beholden to him, who by his industry, " on neglected, and consequently waste land, has in- " creased the stock of corn which they wanted."

It would be superfluous to point out similar evils in the other European nations. With regard to France, under its old Government, which is more immediately interesting to the question, I desire no more to be said in support of my opinion than what is contained in Mr. Young's own travels. It will there be found that it was not the great population of that country which occasioned the poverty and wretchedness of the multitude, but that it was the monopoly of the land by a dissolute tyrannical Nobility and Priesthood, whose possession operated effectually to diminish the produce of the soil, and to blast with sterility those plains upon which Nature had lavished her richest bounty. The arbitrary and enormous exactions of the Agents of the Government aggravated the distress of the people, among whom lay acres sufficient to make them as happy as the American farmer. It is the miserable policy of Governments that makes so many poor in Europe ; and what is the cause of the people being in general much more happy and wealthy in Britain than in Germany ? Not " Corruption," as those who fatten by it would make us believe. It is because we have much less of the old system remaining ; because men are more enlightened, industry encouraged, and property better secured ; because our ancestors have wrung from the hand of power, and bequeathed us more Liberty than is enjoyed under any other Monarchy ; nor can these blessings be preserved but by that spirit which acquired them.

But it may still be said, America has more acres in proportion to the number of its inhabitants than any country in Europe. I shall not dispute this, because it is of no importance to my argument. I contend that

that there is a sufficiency of acres in Europe to make every man as comfortable as the American farmer, and that the extent of territory in the New World does not alone prevent indigence among the people. It is the spirit of their Government, which encourages not only Agriculture, but Manufactures and Commerce, and discourages War. Look at Holland! The number of poor in Holland is perhaps as small as in America, and certainly much less than in any other European nation; yet Holland contains very few, and those very unproductive acres. It is the most populous spot in Europe, and, leaving her poor out of the calculation, is twenty times more populous than America. How happens it then, that with so few acres, and so many inhabitants, the multitude of the Dutch are even more wealthy and comfortable than the American farmer? Because, though her Government is very defective, its spirit encourages industry, commerce, and œconomy, and always avoids War, unless forced into it by some insidious friend. It is the encouragement given to Manufactures and Commerce, as well as Agriculture, rather than the quantity of acres, that makes a people rich and happy. Dr. Smith, and all profound political œconomists, affirm, every Artizan, Manufacturer, and Labourer, to be as valuable to a state as acres of land, and that the greater the population, if Government animates and properly directs industry the greater will be the riches of the country, and enjoyments of the people. It is wicked pernicious policy alone that proves, and such shallow or deluded politicians as Mr. Young, who assert, that population is the cause of poverty, and that the richest man who ever lived was Adam, because he alone was landed proprietor of the whole world.

The view Mr. Young takes of America, with regard to paying taxes, is equally unfair with his "*Spe-*

"*culations*" respecting her Representative Government. He says, that a Farmer in the Back Settlements may have plenty of beef, mutton, corn, wool; he may be rendered quite easy and happy, by a superfluity of the necessaries of life; but for want of Circulation, of Commerce, he will not be able to pay a single Tax; and therefore, when America is involved in a War, and called upon for Taxes, she will be ruined. *When* she is involved in a War!--But her Government will not every few years alarm, mislead, and madden the people into one, because the Government emanates *from* the people, *for* the people's benefit, and is not directed by an ambitious or selfish junto:—And it is unjust in Mr. Young to estimate the power of America to pay taxes by the farmers in the *back settlements*. He owns, that the duties laid on the distilleries in Scotland, do not pay for the collection, and says, that the expence of collecting taxes from the farmers in the back settlements, would also be more than could pay for their collection: would it not, therefore, be as fair to conclude, that Britain cannot pay taxes, because the Scotch Distilleries cannot, as to conclude that America cannot pay taxes, because the farmers in the back settlements cannot? A little consideration will shew us, that America like Britain, has circulation and commerce; like London, Liverpool, Bristol and Glasgow; it has Philadelphia, Boston, Charlestown and New-York:—these last, indeed, may not be so extensive and rich as the former; but, two hundred years ago, London was not a fourth part so wealthy and populous as at present; and is not America daily increasing her commerce, manufactures and population?

Thus, I think, Mr. Young's, "Experiment," "Practice," and "Events," as applied to America, are wholly illusory. Representative Government has stood in Peace, and flourished in America twelve years. "Yes," says he, "but it will be destroyed

"when

" when she has a numerous indigent poor."—*When* she has an indigent poor!—but that will never be, more than at present, while the spirit of her government prefers, as it now does, Peace and Industry, to War and Corruption. He would condemn Representative Government from the " experiment" of a few months attempted in France, in the midst of the most dreadful warfare ever known ; but in America, " Experiment," Practice," and Events," which he says, ought to be the only rule of conduct, he would set wholly aside, because *there* he finds they are strongly against him, and that he cannot hold up a *terrifying example* of what *has* happened. He would condemn Representative Government in America on " speculation" and " theory," which he a thousand times says, ought never to guide us ; he would condemn it by predicting what *will* happen, not by shewing what *has* happened. On the contrary, in France, the experiment of a few months, is to be our only guide, and theory and speculation we are totally to disregard ; in America, theory and speculation are to be our only guide, and the experiment of twelve years we are totally to disregard ! ! !—How Mr. Young can reconcile these palpable contradictions, or how any man, of the least understanding, could be duped by them, is beyond my comprehension. It may justly be asked of him, in his own words, " what " inducement have we, therefore, to listen to *your spe-* " *culations,* that condemn what all *America* feels to " be good?"—(p. 85.)

Hence, I think, I may fairly affirm, that in America, there is a noble instance of the blessings flowing from Representative Government. The Revolution there, was at first as much execrated as that of France now is. In 1777, the same invectives may be found in the proclamation of General Burgoyne, that in 1792 were brought forth in the manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick : " He appealed to the suffering " thousands

"thousands in the provinces, whether the present "unnatural rebellion has not been made a foundation "for the compleatest system of Tyranny that ever "God, in his displeasure, suffered for a time to be "exercised over a froward and stubborn generation. "Arbitrary imprisonment, confiscation of property, "persecution, and torture, unprecedented in the In- "quisitions of the Romish Church, are among the "palpable enormities which verify the affirmative. "These are inflicted by assemblies and committees, "who dare profess themselves Friends to Liberty, "upon the most quiet subjects, without distinction of "age or sex, for the sole crime, often for the sole sus- "picion, of having adhered in principle to the go- "vernment under which they were born, and to which "by every tie divine and human, they owe allegiance. "To consummate these shocking proceedings, the "profanation of religion is added to the most profli- "gate prostitution of common sense ; the consciences "of men are set at nought, and multitudes are com- "pelled, not only to bear arms, but also to swear sub- "jection, to an Usurpation they abhor." Here is an epitome of all that has been said and written against the French ; and why should we not suppose, that were they left to themselves, they would soon become as orderly, peaceable, flourishing, and happy, as the Americans? France has the natural sources to make merchants like Holland, manufacturers like Britain, and farmers like America; and, I believe, the Concert of Princes was first formed against her from a knowledge that a few years Peace would make her people so wealthy, comfortable and happy, that instead of being a terrible warning, she would be a seducing example to surrounding nations; that the Despots of the Continent saw arising from the ruins of French Despotism, the fabrick of human felicity, and consequently the harbinger of their destruction, and therefore they wished to strangle it. At present, France is neither

an

an example, nor a warning ; she is in a state of madness, occasioned—not by personal Representation, as Mr. Young continually asserts—for he might as justly say, the shocking yellow fever which lately broke out in Philadelphia, was the effect of Representative Government in America—but by the infamous Invasion of the Duke of Brunswick, and the Treachery and Alarm raging in her bosom. I therefore affirm, that an admirable proof of the utility of Representative Government exists in America ; and deny, that the experiment of personal Representation has been even *tried*, much less "*completely made*" in France, orthat she should either encourage, or deter us, from salutary Reform. France would not Reform till it was too late.—May her example, in that respect, be indeed a warning to Britain!

Having shewn Mr. Young's fallacy in condemning Representative Government in France upon "experiment," and in America upon "speculation," and having established the experiment of America in my own favour, I shall now notice a few of the most mischievous falsehoods, and absurd contradictions, which he has advanced against Reform, but without stopping to examine every groundless assertion, and trivial argument. I shall take his leading reasons only ; the most unfounded and atrocious of which is, where he maintains, "that the example "of the King of France should deter all other Kings "from listening to the complaints of their subjects. "He wished to Reform ; he was the first Monarch "who was desirous of making his people happy, and "*he died for it on a scaffold!*"—It is difficult to say, whether the falsehood contained, or the tyranny recommended in this passage, should most provoke indignation! The falsehood is so well known, that none but Mr. Young could have had effrontery sufficient to have asserted it ; and the sentiment conveyed is more dangerous to the liberties and happi-

ness

ness of Britain, than all the works of Mr. Paine and the " Jacobin Societies." The King of France *did not* die on the scaffold, because he listened to Reform ;—it was because he would *not* listen to it till it was *too late* ;—till he was *compelled*. Instead of listening to Reform, he listened to evil Counsellors ; he suffered himself to be guided by persons who lavished the public money on useless placemen and pensioners ; on favourites, parasites, and the most pernicious of all traitors, *regular-bred courtiers*, who, to supply their prodigality, loaded the people with Taxes ; and finding, at last, their profligate extravagance was on the eve of ruining them, agreed to Reform as their only chance of salvation. They first threatened the Parliament of Paris if it did not comply with their demands :—did that look like a wish to Reform ? They next tried the shift of the Notables, and even imprisoned some of their Members who demanded a Reform ; but like the result of their conduct to the Parliament of Paris, these shifts and menaces also proved ineffectual ; and after many other vain expedients, they were at last forced to call the States General, in hopes that they would cover their past iniquities, and grant a new lease for plundering the Nation. In that hope, however, they were also mistaken. The people had long smarted with patience under the Tyranny of the Nobles, and extortions of the Government ; they were now menaced with large additional burthens, and the general danger created a general alarm. The spirit of the country was roused by the infamy of the Administration ; and finding the Court only stooped to concession, to hide its mismanagement, and insure its future robberies, rather than from a sincere wish to reform and make them happy, the people resolved no more to trust to those who had invariably betrayed them ; the cause of the people triumphed ; the rapacious views of the courtiers were defeated,

and

and the old Despotism stripped of its riches and grandeur, was too feeble, ugly, and corrupt, to protract its existence. Such was the commencement of the French Revolution. It was not the desire of the King to *Reform*, but the desire of his Ministers to *rob*, that brought him to the scaffold.

All the calamities with which France is afflicted, are ascribed, by Mr. Young, to personal Representation, and the same are predicted in England, if any Reform of the House of Commons takes place. Accordingly, a number of his paragraphs conclude with "Such is the monster, personal Representation:"—"Such the result of that Constitution founded on per-"sonal Representation:"—"Power, in the hands of "the people, by means of personal Representation, "has ruined France:" &c.—And thus he proceeds, asserting, that all the misfortunes in which that nation is involved, are the consequence of the will of the people being supreme. In answer to this, which is the *sole object* of his book, I shall shew, first, that he contradicts himself, and that the very reverse of what he so often repeats and labours to establish, may be proved by his own words; and secondly, that the experiment of Personal Representation has not been attempted in France, till *after* the downfal of Monarchy, and, therefore, it *cannot* justly be blamed with producing that event, or the transactions which preceded it.

P. 91, he says, that "if the House of Commons "were such Representatives" (as in France) "they "*would be guided* by the folly, madness, and passions "of the people." Seven pages further on, however, he thinks quite differently, and that "Representa-"tion destroys itself, and generates with infallible "certainty an oligarchy of mobbish demagogues, "till of all other voices, that *least heard* is the *real* "will of the people.---Again (p. 106.) he maintains, "that a Parliament constituted on personal Repre-"sentation can act *no otherwise* than by the *immediate*

" *impulse* of the people." But this, he ten pages before, affirms to be wrong; he thinks, " a word " however, might be said on the point of personal " Representation, rendering the will of the people " *supreme*. The *futility* of the idea is demonstrated, " in the Assemblies *so chosen*, in France; their first " merit, on Jacobin principles, is, that of speaking " the sovereign will of the people, by which ex- " pression, is always understood the Majority: But, " so truly abominable is this system of Government, " that there has not been a single instance of great " and marked importance, in which the *Minority*, " and commonly, a *very small Minority*, has not, by " means of terror, carried all before them." Thus, he at one time affirms, that the will of the people " *would* guide" personal Representatives, and yet, that among such Representatives, the will of the people would be " *least* heard."---That personal Representatives " can act *no otherwise*, than by the *immediate im-* " *pulse* of the people," and that every instance, of great and marked importance, in France, has, by means of terror, been carried by the will of a *very small Minority!*---These contradictions are fatal to all Mr Young has written, and are a just illustration of the fallacy and absurdity of the whole of his book.

His inconsistency, in condemning personal Representation, might be farther exposed, but it will shorten the subject much to shew, that the case of France is wholly inapplicable, and is neither an example, nor a warning to Britian, with regard to Reform, particularly as applied by Mr. Young. The Assembly which framed the Constitution of 1789, was not elected by universal suffrage, nor agreeably to any new system of Reform. It was elected according to the rules, and under the direction of the French Monarchy; according to a system established for centuries. Reform, or Personal Representation, therefore, are no more to be blamed for what it did, that was blameable, than they would be, if our

House

House of Commons were to exterminate every Friend to Liberty, and establish Despotism in England. The Constituent Assembly was elected according to the old "Mild benignant" French Monarchy; according to a system, "The work of the wisdom of ages;" yet it was that very Assembly which Mr. Burke reprobated, and Mr. Paine applauded, and against which the Convention at Pilnitz, the foundation of the present War, was formed. It was the authority of that Assembly which the British Government would never fully recognize: It is that Assembly which Lords Auckland and Hood, and even Mr. Young describe, when they mention "The miscreants, who, for *four years*, distracted "France." Then why should the transactions of that Assembly deter us from Reform, since it was elected according to the Constitution of the old French Despotism? It should rather be an argument *in favour* of Reform, because, according to Mr. Young and others, it produced much mischief, and it was an old UNREFORMED Assembly.

The second Assembly was not elected by universal suffrage, and of the third Assembly, it is uncandid to speak, for, during its existence, it has rather been the Council of War of a great Army, than the seat of Peace and temperate Legislation: and it might as reasonably be concluded, that the British Government is despotic, because, for the sake of discipline, Despotism must be exercised in the British Camp under the Duke of York, as to conclude that Anarchy, Confusion, and Despotism, are the certain accompanyments of French Principles of Liberty, and will always be exercised by the Convention.

Having now shewn the inconsistency with which Mr. Young would build up his "Warning" against personal Representation, by which he always means

Reform; having also shewn that the French Revolution, and the calamities afflicting that country, did not arise *from* personal Representation, which has neither had time nor opportunity to operate there; and that therefore the transactions in France have no analogy whatever with Parliamentary Reform in this kingdom; I shall, for a while quit French affairs to examine what Mr. Young says of the British Constitution, and particularly of the House of Commons.

"But" (says he, p. 92) "the House of Commons "are corrupted and bribed. And if the nature of "such an Assembly demands to be corrupted in or- "der to pursue the public good, who but a Visionary "can wish to remove corruption?" Must not an Assembly constituted for the public good, be of a most *detestable nature*, if it demands to be bribed in order to discharge its duty? Again, "Influence, or, as "Reformers call it, Corruption, is the oil which "makes the machine of Government go well." And p. 171. "EXTRAVAGANT COURTS, SELFISH MI- "NISTERS, *and* CORRUPT MAJORITIES, are so "intimately interwoven with our practical Freedom, "that it would require better political Anatomists, "than our modern Reformers, to shew, on fact, that "we did not owe our Liberty to the identical Evils "which they want to expunge." Could the whole National Convention more grossly Libel the King, the Ministers, and the Parliament of this country? Surely, Mr. Young must have known, that he was writing the most bitter and dangerous satire on our Government, when he said, that extravagant Courts, Selfish Ministers, and *Corrupt Majorities*, were intimately interwoven with our Freedom, and yet assert, that this is "that glorious Constitution "which is the inheritance and pride of Britons!" I appeal to every candid man whether the friends to the Liberty of the Press, or Mr. Young, seem most disposed

disposed "*to publish the Corruptions of the Constitu-* "*tion*, in other words, *to write it down*. (vide p. 163.)

In answering this frontless avowal of Corruption, I must suppose the House of Commons composed of either good or bad men. If they are the former, and are suffered to exercise their own discretion, they will pursue the public welfare without Corruption, unless it is presumed they cannot see it without the explanation of a Bank Note. If they are bad men, they will be bribed to do evil as readily as good. It may indeed be said, that influence is often necessary to make a virtuous man do a virtuous action; and that is true: For, although a virtuous man will act virtuously when he does act, yet there are occasions where he is not called upon by duty to act at all: But on the contrary, a Member of Parliament *is in duty bound* to act, to take either one side or another; and if he is a good man, he will act for the best, according to his conscience, without either Corruption or Influence. It is an absurdity to say, that a man can be *corrupted* to act *virtuously*; because if he acts from a corrupt motive, he is equally vicious whether the action be good or bad, and will not much consider whether he does right or wrong, while his primary object, Corruption, is obtained. The same reasoning will apply to the assertion, that "a man "may be bribed to act wisely;" unless the man is supposed to be a fool. Nor do I understand how a man can be *influenced* to do good, for, in a case, like that of the House of Commons, where he *must* act, he must be pre-disposed to do evil before he can be influenced to do good, and consequently he must be a bad man: And all the arguments in favour of Influence, do, in fact, go to prove, that the Members of the House of Commons, are traitors to the State, who would ruin it if they were not influenced to the contrary. As Mr. Young has quoted Dr. Johnson's definition

definition of "*Principle*," I will take what the same author says of "*To Influence*," which is, "to modify to *any* purpose." If Influence, therefore, can modify to any purpose, (which it certainly can, or else it is no longer Influence,) and if our House of Commons is, as Mr. Young asserts, directed by Influence, then it is the mere creature of the Executive Power which possesses that Influence; and it is a mistake to suppose that it makes laws, or does either a good or a bad action: It is the King's Ministers, who, holding the Influence that directs it, ought to be wholly blamed or thanked for whatever it does, because, they may *influence* it to the most wicked, as well as the most wise measures; and it would be better, if the "Monster," as Mr. Young calls it, were annihilated, for then morality would not be wounded; Government would be carried on at a less expence, and with more ease and vigour; and Ministers would be much more responsible for their conduct.

But while I maintain influencing or corrupting the Representative Body by the Executive Power (which in this country, is not, I hope, the case, notwithstanding Mr. Young's assertions) to be the most pernicious of all Policy, and the blackest of all Treason, I am far from maintaining that Members of Parliament should not be rewarded for their trouble: On the contrary, I shink they should be openly paid a regular, ample stipend; but it should be paid merely as a reward for their trouble, and not as an equivalent for their honesty; they should publicly receive a certain sum, and not secretly take a recompence which they are ashamed to own. If it were the custom, that our Ambassadors should receive no pay from our own Government, and were permitted to take as much as they could procure from the Courts to which they were sent, can it be doubted that they would sacrifice our interest for that of those from whom they expected a reward? In like manner, it would

would be folly to suppose that a Parliament pensioned by the Government, would guard the interests of the people against the Government.

I am at a loss to conceive how the Corruption of the House of Commons can be deemed the *cause* of our prosperity and happiness, nor have I ever seen any fact produced tending to prove it. It is asserted, that we are prosperous and happy, and admitted that Corruption does exist; and, therefore, it is inferred, because Corruption is a part of the system which makes us prosperous and happy, *that it is the cause* of our prosperity and happiness. But nothing can, I think, be more false than this inference: It might as justly be inferred, that a mixture of weeds, among the corn, is the cause of a plentiful harvest; that the dross mixed in the ore with gold and silver, is the cause of their value; or that insects and locusts are the cause of a luxuriant herbage. Would a tradesman ascribe his accumulation of wealth to the pilfering of his till by his shopman? Corruption may, indeed, be a *part* of a system, good upon the whole; but it is a *bad* part, and ought to be removed. It is not to Corruption we are to attribute our prosperity and happiness, but the portion of freedom we enjoy, and to the spirit and industry of the people.

I shall now consider the question of Reform under four distinct heads, and in doing so, shall aim at brevity, and endeavour, as much as possible, to avoid a repetition of the many arguments which have been advanced in favour of it. I shall examine

The *necessity* of Reforming the House of Commons.

How far a Reform can be made *in conformity* with the *spirit, principles*, and *practice*, of the Constitution.

The *time* for making a Reform.

What the *nature* of the Reform should be.

Of the NECESSITY of Reform, the removal of Mr. Young's *salutary* Corruption, is the strongest proof; for Corruption, if practised, must destroy the whole original

original design of the House of Commons, which, even according to himself, was to advise the King in important matters of State. Now, as advice does not mean assent, but must often be contrary to the opinions and wishes of those who ask it; and as it is well known that the King cannot act contrary to the advice of his Commons, it is, in fact, a controul, a command. If, therefore, Corruption or Influence makes them advise the King to whatever he recommends, their controul is lost, and the King is as absolute as the Empress of Russia, so long as he possesses the means to *influence*. "If Courts *can* be perfidious, you are to suppose they *will* be so; and if "you have not so provided as to turn that perfidy "to the benefit of the people, you confess at once, "that your Constitution is visionary," says Mr. Young (p. 68,)—If so, what provision is there against the perfidy of the British Court, while it dictates to Parliament by its influence? With Corruption and Influence, then, our House of Commons must be an illusion, and a dangerous illusion; because it is not responsible, and takes off all responsibility from the Crown. It must give a false appearance of sanction, and bind the people to whatever the Crown proposes, and pays for with the money taken from the people: It would be as if a Court of Law were to grant to a highwayman a licence to rob, upon condition that he paid into it a part of his plunder. With Corruption, our House of Commons would be both *useless* and EXPENSIVE; but I am far, very far from believing, it is governed by Corruption, and I think it my duty here to remark, on the shameless effrontery of Mr. Reeves, in thanking Mr. Young for asserting, that we are governed by extravagant Courts, selfish Ministers, and corrupt Majorities, (vide p. 171.) and also to express my surprise, that the House of Commons has not addressed the King, or that the Attorney General has not been commanded to prosecute in his book, that which in Mr. Horne Took's petition, respecting

specting the Westminster Election, was, by all parties, deemed the most gross and scandalous libel that ever came before them.

Mr. Young asserts, and, indeed, it is the common doctrine of all those who coincide with him in opinion, that the House of Commons was always designed to represent, not the people at large, but the people of property in the kingdom. Admitting this to be a fact, let us see how far its present state agrees with the design. Are the paupers of Stockbridge, Barnstable, Seaford, all the boroughs in Cornwall, and a majority of the boroughs in the kingdom, the men of property? Why are the wealthy Inhabitants of St. Mary-le-bonne, and other parishes in London, who in point of property, are able to buy the electors of a majority of the House of Commons, excluded from sending Representatives? Why are the wealthy Merchants and Manufacturers of Manchester, Sheffield, Birmingham, and even of London, denied the right of voting? But, it will, probably, be said, a rich and commercial man may, at the expence of five thousand pounds, procure a seat in Parliament, if he desires it, and this shews the utility of the rotten boroughs, and proves that property predominates in the House of Commons: To this I ask, will a commercial, or any other man, lay out five thousand pounds without the prospect of a return? If we see a rich avaricious man expending immense sums, to obtain the influence over a borough, we cannot mistake his object; it must be with him an adventure, a speculation, which he hopes, will, in one way or another, return a proportionate profit. And the mischief is, that the traffic may not be merely confined to British subjects, but may, by foreign Princes, be converted into the means of ruling our Councils, and ruining us as a nation: for, if Mr. Pitt spoke truly, when he declared, "it was notorious that the Nabob of Arcot had fifteen Members in that House, and that they did not act upon

" an identity of interest with the people," why may not any other Prince send in his members, and by expending a million sterling, take the money out of Englishmen's pockets, and force them to fight his battles? If it be said, though the Electors are poor, the Representatives are wealthy, I answer, that we not only find beggarly boroughs, but needy members sitting for them. And as to " the property of " the kingdom being in the hands of the Members*," I will ask where is the property (divested of their places and pensions, and other political emoluments) of Mess. Pitt, Dundas, Jenkinson, Long, Rose, Steele, Addington, and Burke? These are the leading men in Parliament, yet, according to Mr. Young's argument, they must lead to mischief, because they have little or no property.---Look at the opposition:---See, (according to Mr. Young's argument again) what ample security we have that they will act for the public good, because they have large possessions. Mess. Grey, Whitbread, Lambton, Byng, Wharton, M. A. Taylor, Baker, Lord Wycombe, &c- &c. either possess, or are immediate heirs to large estates; and Mess. Erskine and Sheridan are, of all others, interested in the peace and prosperity of the country, as their lucrative incomes from the bar and the theatre, would be the first species of property likely to suffer from a convulsion. ---Go up to the House of Peers, and search for the property (places and pensions excepted) of Lords Grenville, Hawkesbury, Chatham, Auckland, and Loughborough. Compare the leaders of administration and opposition throughout, and it will be found, that the former are poor, and the latter are wealthy; ---Nay, take the aggregate of the number, and fortunes of " the Jacobin Society of the Friends of the " People," and compare them with the House of Commons, (places and pensions excepted) and they

* Young p 84.

will,

will, perhaps, be found to be as wealthy and respectable as that pure body. If, as Mr. Young asserts, property were to be the foundation of our confidence in public men, there would instantly be a change in administration, and a Reform of Parliament.

I therefore deny, that in the construction of the House of Commons, there is any operating principle or controul, which secures the protection of property, more than there is among a club of stock-brokers, whose primary object always is their own immediate advantage, whether it be connected with the welfare of the nation, or not. Hence, if we are to be guided by what Mr. Young affirms, of the House of Commons, that *it is a Representation of property*, a Reform becomes as indispensable as upon any other principle. What, though some members are men of property, they may consent to invade the possessions of the rich in general, because they may receive a private compensation that will not only reimburse their own personal loss, but plentifully reward them for betraying the interests of men of property at large, who have no more controul over them, than the Swinish multitude of Manchester and Birmingham. Distribute the elective franchise equally among men of property, and I am content, because I believe such a distribution would render the House of Commons independent, which is the true object of any Reform.

It may, perhaps, be said, our Constitution, originally, recognized only as men of property the owners of landed estates; that they all now have votes, and therefore the ancient spirit is preserved. Without enquiring into the abuses of County Elections, or shewing the futility of the expectation, that eighty county Members could secure us against four hundred and seventy-eight from cities and rotten boroughs, I shall content myself at present with asserting

asserting, that the ancient, spirit, principles, and "*Practice,*" of the Constitution, recognized as men, who had a right to be consulted in the National Councils, all who were of CONSIDERATION, whether by Landed Property, as at first was the case, or by Manufactures or Commerce, which afterwards occasoned Citizens and Burgesses to be called to Parliament, and which now are of much more importance to the kingdom than all its land. I shall shew this more fully when I consider how far a Reform can be constitutionally made. At present, I shall only assert, that according to the original principles, and practice, of the Constitution, and according to Mr. Young's definition of what the House of Commons *is,* (a Representation, not of Persons, but of Property), a Reform is absolutely necessary, because it neither agrees with what it originally was, and now ought to be, nor with his description of it; for Property is not even so much represented in the House of Commons as Persons.

Such, upon the principles of the Anti-Reformers, is the necessity of reforming Parliament; and if the practical evils arising from the defective Representation are considered, they will be found still more urgent in favour of that measure. It is, I believe, universally admitted, that the prosperity of this country has arisen from the superior portion of Freedom enjoyed by its inhabitants, above those of the surrounding nations: If that be the case, the continuance of our prosperity must depend on the continuance of our Freedom, and, if we find the House of Commons easily agreeing to narrow the latter, we cannot expect that the former will have a very long existence. The ready acquiescence to laying on additional burthens; the profusion of the public money, and the invariable, enormous accumulation of debt, demonstrate the certainty, that at some time, we must reach the summit of the borrowing system:

system : And even before this natural death of our public credit, the flames of some unnecessary war may melt the waxen wings, on which, like Icarus, we have towered to such an unnatural height. But what is more immediately alarming, the most arbitrary laws are found necessary, and are enacted, to ensure the collection of the Revenue : Those Laws are destructive of Freedom, and consequently must destroy our prosperity, for they openly and unequivocally invade our Liberties, and tend gradually to abolish and totally to annihilate them. The Right of an Englishman to a Trial by a Jury of his equals, has long been esteemed the dearest he possesses ; but this, in certain cases, which, with the increase of our debt, are annually accumulating, is compleatly abolished. It is not that justice is done between man and man that constitutes Liberty, so much as that justice is done between the Government and the People. In the most arbitrary and tyrannical Monarchies, strict justice is generally administered between individuals : nay, it is more easy to be obtained, perhaps, than in Britain, because the expence is smaller. All men act justly, unless they have an interest in acting otherwise : Despots, therefore, can have no interest in deciding partially between individuals : On the contrary, they will be eager to do rigid justice, in order to palliate their own robberies. Of what importance, then, is it, that we have Juries to try actions between John and William ? These might be as fairly decided, if there were no other Jury than the twelve, or four Judges. It is in cases between the Crown and People that injustice is to be guarded against, Yet, we find Parliament yearly sanctioning in the Excise, Stamp, and other Revenue Laws, the gradual Abolition of the Trial by Jury ; because, according to the late Earl of Chatham and Sir George Saville, their Corruption involved us in the American War, which brought a debt of an hundred Millions on our heads ; and, according

cording to Mr. Young, they are now to add another hundred to destroy a combination of Reformers ; i. e. to preserve to Lords Camelford and Egremont the privilege of sending Members to Parliament for the Sheep Cots of old Sarum, and the Stones of Midhurst! And to preserve "Extravagant Courts, Sel-"fish Ministers, and Corrupt Majorities!!!" (vide p. 171.)

The oppressive operation of those Revenue Laws, particularly of the Excise, has often been ably demonstrated. During the present Administration they have been eagerly extended. What can be more vexatious than that the Stamp Office should keep in its pay Informers, who, before they will be such, must have lost all sense of shame or honesty ; who must have abandoned all hopes of ever being respectable in society, and who, consequently, must hate, and become the enemies of mankind, because they know mankind despise and detest them? What can be more vexatious or destructive of Freedom, than that one of these reptiles may go into a tradesman's shop, purchase a pair of gloves *, and by quirk or perjury, (for the oath of such a miscreant, is sufficient, and is taken in preference to that of the most respectable tradesman) fine the vender in ten guineas, half of which goes to himself? Is this tried by a Jury? No. Who tries it? A Magistrate, or two, appointed by, and receiving a salary, from the prosecutor, (the Government ;) it is tried by men who subsist on the fund to which the other half of the penalty is carried, and who, therefore, in a certain degree, have a common interest with the Informer. For additional instances of this kind, besides the Excise, Farming of Taxes, &c. consult the Hatters, Perfumers, and many other Shop-

* This Tax has been repealed since the publication of the first Edition of this Pamphlet, but the same complaint holds good with respect to Perfumery, hats, &c. &c.

the

keepers. Liberty, which animates the industry and enterprize of the people, and is universally allowed to have been the cause of our prosperity, can no more exist under a continual extension of these laws, than ice in a furnace; and when once the cause is removed, the effect will not long remain. Whether the House of Commons, as at present constituted, is likely to increase or diminish the debt, which gives birth to these proceedings, is obvious. Here I will not take theory, but Mr. Young's favourite "Practice," and according to practice, our debt will rapidly increase, and our Freedom as rapidly vanish. Spain was once the most powerful, because the most free nation in Europe: Her Cortes resembled our Parliament, but were, perhaps, much more pure. Corruption, indolence, pride, and oppression*, stole into her government, from whence they were imbibed by her Nobles, and her People: Her Freedom, of course, gradually disappeared, until its remembrance was lost; and behold now, how wretched are her inhabitants; how insignificant as a nation!

Besides, the ready acquiescence to Taxes, and to the arbitrary Laws found necessary to exact them, there are other circumstances, not less urgent in favour of Parliamentary Reform. Why were not the

* The most detestable means of her oppression, was, the Inquisition, which has been long proverbially execrated by every honest Briton. During the tyrannical reign of Charles the Second, the introduction of it into this country was openly recommended from the Bench, by the Recorder of London, who, on the well known Trial of Penn and Mead, at the Old Bailey, in 1670, said, "till "now I never understood the reason of the Policy and Prudence of "the Spaniards in suffering the Inquisition among them, and cer-"tainly it will *never be well with us* till something like the Spanish "Inquisition be in England." (See State Trials.) The same shameless Doctrine is now revived. Mr. Young says, were he a Spanish Minister, he would not abolish it! Probably, he wishes to introduce it into England, and to place it under the care of Mr. Reeves, than whom a more fit Director could not be found.

violaters

violaters of the Constitution in the case of the Middlesex Election punished? Why was Lord Mansfield permitted to imprison Bingley two years against the Law? Why were Ministers allowed to continue the American War without the shadow of ability, or a hope of success, during several years after the nation disapproved of it? Or what is more recent, why was not an inquiry granted into the conduct of Mr. Rose, in the Westminster Election? Why have the chief agitators of the Manchester, Mount-street, and Birmingham Riots escaped justice? To these queries, Mr. Young will, perhaps, answer, "Why! Be-"cause all those measures were only *oiling* the ma-"chinery of Government, to make it go smoothly; "they were only some of the *oil of Influence*, which "is Corruption, in the eyes of Reformers."

It is not necessary to enumerate the pensioning of Magistrates, the building of Barracks, the landing of foreign troops without the consent of Parliament, the raising of an army by voluntary contributions, which may be kept up as long as Government pleases, without the consent of Parliament, and a thousand other similar instances, in order to convince unprejudiced minds towards what centre the whole transactions of the Legislature gravitate; nor might it be safe to animadvert on them freely. Let those, who desire a more perfect illustration, read the late History of this Country, and particularly of the present Ministers, where they may collect a sufficient number to fill a volume. Shew me one instance, during the boasted administration of the last ten years, in which the House of Commons has supported the interests of the People, and of justice, in opposition to the wishes of the Crown? If it can be shewn, that, upon one or two marked occasions, it has done this, then, I may think, its misconduct rather the effect of error, than of criminal acquiescence: But if this cannot be shewn, then I must either conclude our present

present Governors to be the wisest that ever existed in the world, since they have not erred once in ten years, or that Parliament is so servile as never to thwart them. In the case of the late Russian Armament, the House of Commons, having no sympathy of sentiment with the nation, voted, according to the wishes of the ministers, first for, and then against, a measure. What was the consequence? They were proved to have acted contrary, and the Minister, afterwards, to have acted in conformity with the will of the people. By this means all the public esteem was transferred to Mr. Pitt, which would have fallen to the Representatives of the people, if they had done their duty. Our Premier, in this way, has artfully gained all his popularity; for, while he affects to despise the will of the people, he, rather than hazard his situation, obeys it on dangerous occasions. And, as in the Russian Armament he robbed the House of Commons, so in the present War, he robbed the Crown of the public affection; for last spring when the calamities it brought on were daily rendering it more unpopular, his friends industriously circulated a report, that it was then continued quite against his inclination, but that higher powers (meaning the King and his friends) would have it so. By this means, his popularity was at once preserved, both among those who wished to terminate, and those who wished to continue the War. It has hitherto been the practice, that when any Act of Grace was to be done, the King, by being made the instrument in performing it, should reap all the advantage arising from the national gratitude: Mr. Pitt, however, has reversed this custom; and when any odious measure is to take place, the Crown is made not only the agent, but the parent of it, while his friends exculpate him, by shrugs, and hints of regret at the necessity of submitting. Thus we find him at once robbing both the King and Commons

of the public esteem and gratitude, and throwing all that is unfortunate or obnoxious to their charge: He puts himself where the Monarch formerly stood; becomes the dispenser of every thing that is gracious, and by this artful unconstitutional conduct, concentrates in his person all that is to be admired and beloved, either in the executive or legislative power, and filches a popularity, not more unnatural, than formidable and alarming.

Notwithstanding the contumely with which the will of the people, calmly expressed in an assembly of Delegates, is treated by the Anti-Reformers, yet they often justify their own conduct on that very will which they affect to condemn: If it is said, a Parliamentary Reform is necessary, in order to ascertain the will of the people in a peaceable constitutional manner, they answer, Parliament ought not to be guided by the will of the people, and therefore a Reform is needless: But throw the blame of the American War on Parliament, and they shift their ground, they change sides, and boast that it was popular. They justify themselves in commencing the American War, on the will of the people, and yet they deny that the will of the people should be their guide! It is necessary this should be decided; Either let the will of the people, or the will of Parliament, since they are to be distinct things, be the rule of action. If the will of Parliament is to be the rule, then the blame of the American War attaches to them alone, and justifies a Reform, in order to prevent another such evil: If the will of the people is to be the rule, then, as the House of Commons voted directly against it, in the case of the Russian Armament, that Armament justifies a Reform also.

But it will not be improper to enquire a little into the nature of the Will of the People. Upon examination, it will be found to be of two very distinct kinds, the one originating with themselves, their own pure offspring,

offspring, the other, a courtly bastard. A clear instance of the latter may be found in the fate of Mr. Fox's East India Bill, which passed the House of Commons without a murmur among the people, and was even approved, till the secret advisers of the Crown raised an alarm about charters, and succeeded in stimulating the public, to express the strongest disapprobation of the measure. The popularity of the American War was also hatched in the Cabinet. The national indignation was insidiously roused, by holding up the refusal of the Americans to pay taxes, like ourselves, while the true cause of the quarrel, the question of Representation, was kept in the back ground, or, if started, was answered, by the abuses in our own; —by instancing Manchester, Birmingham, &c.—by the deformity of the British House of Commons, was the American War justified, and therefore had a Reform taken place twenty years ago, one chief sophistical pretext of that unhappy War, had not existed. It is likewise a courtly popularity, which has sanctioned the present War. Proclamations, camps, and addresses, were not regarded with indifference; Mr. Pensioner Reeves, from the Court, sounded the trumpet of alarm, and was re-echoed by the whole kingdom; thus a popularity, originating in the Cabinet, was given to the War, which I call a courtly, a bastard popularity. But how was the American War stopped, or a War with Russia prevented? Not by an expression of the public will, created in, and directed by the Cabinet, but by an expression of the public will, emanating purely from the people themselves, and in direct opposition to the wishes of the Cabinet. On those occasions, the people could not be duped; and I think the will of the people, that sanctioned in its commencement, and the will of the people that forcibly brought to a conclusion, the American War, were as different in their nature, as in their object. Ministers will always be attempting to create these bastard, courtly wills, for their own selfish purposes, to the injury of

the nation; it is the duty of the House of Commons to detect and expose them, and to guard the people from being duped into ruin; but, instead of this, we find the House of Commons generally the chief instrument in promoting the delusion: in the Russian Armament they were notoriously so. And therefore, to make them more careful of the interests of the people, to unmask, rather than cover the courtly designs, a Reform has become necessary.

These two different wills of the people were to be traced in the sentiments and conduct of the Alarmists and Anti-Reformers last winter. They exulted in the universal loyalty of the country, in the general affection of the people for the Constitution, and in their concurrence in the measures of government; they exulted in the *courtly* will of the people. But when the question of Reform was started they deprecated the will of the people as the mother of every calamity. If the War was considered, they vaunted that the will of the people was in its favour;—if Reform was considered, they reprobated the will of the people as the most mischievous of all guides. Was it ever boasted, or given as an argument in support of a measure, that the will of the people was against it?—No.—Is not the reverse almost always the case?—Yes. Is not this proof of the necessity of knowing the will of the people, and consequently of Reform? Did not those who boasted the general approbation of the War, and the measures of government, and thereby applaud the will of the people, in fact confess the necessity of Reform?—Nay, a more important confession is to be found in the description the House of Commons gives of itself. In impeachments, such as that now carrying on against Mr. Hastings, they prosecute in the name of ALL the Commons of Great Britain. Thus they themselves own, they ought to be elected by universal suffrage; for to act in the name of *all*, without consulting, or even of being capable of knowing the will of the *Majority*, appears to be inconsistent

sistent with common sense. And of this Mr. Young seems aware, when he asserts, (p. 90,) that the House of Commons *are not* the Representatives of the people, and ought not to be so called. Yet, it was for this very same assertion, that the Sheffield and Nottingham petitions for Reform were rejected last session of Parliament, and even deemed libellous! Is it not, therefore, extraordinary, that Mr. Reeves should recommend a book, containing the same assertions, which the House of Commons deemed a libel, when contained in a petition? And is it not still more extraordinary, that the very men, who bellowed so much about the dignity of the House being insulted by those petitions, should reward Mr. Young with a place, for writing that, which, in St. Stephen's Chapel, they affected to condemn!

The addresses, associations, and general approbation of them, I consider to be direct confessions of the necessity of Reform, because they are confessions of the utility of knowing the will of the people. The House of Commons was instituted for collecting and expressing that will, and ought still to do it; a House of Commons purely elected, being the only Constitutional mouth-piece of the people. For the government, therefore, to seek the sense of the country, in addresses and associations, and to pretend to be guided by the public will, when collected in that partial irregular manner, is, I think, highly unconstitutional, and a most dangerous innovation, tending to supersede the use of the House of Commons altogether. Parliament is the most proper monitor of government; it is in a Reformed House of Commons alone that the voice of the country can be calmly and truly heard. Addresses and associations, for expressing their opinion on public affairs are particularly dangerous, as they admit of hearing only one side of the question, and may often be adopted to give an appearance of popularity to very unpopular measures, thereby deceiving the King, breeding disaffection in the

the people, and leading the one or other, or perhaps both, to ruin. Addresses and associations, therefore, should be discouraged, as delusive, and a Reformed House of Commons be substituted in their stead, where the will of the nation might be fairly and peaceably ascertained.

These are, I think, sufficient reasons to shew he necessity of reforming the Representation in his country. If we enquire how far it can be *constitutionally* done, we shall find, that the ancient spirit, and principles, and "*practice*," of the Constitution recognized *all men of consideration in the State*, as having a right to be present in the King's Councils. At the conquest, indeed, and for some time afterwards, men of landed property were the only persons of consideration in the kingdom; and accordingly we find, in the reign of Henry the IIId, in the first House of Commons of which we have any account of those who composed it, that it consisted *only* of four Knights from each county, who of course represented *landed* proprietors alone. The principles and "practice" of the Constitution, however, being, that *all men of consideration*, who, consequently would be called on for pecuniary aid, should be present in the King's Councils, and trade beginning to shew itself, Citizens and Burgesses were summoned from such towns as were growing into importance. And herein consisted the great excellence of the English Constitution: it adapted itself to all situations, it opened its arms to all men of property as persons more particularly interested in the government of the country, and therefore entitled to a share in the Legislative Assembly. But what an extraordinary deviation from the principle and practice do we now find? The men of the least consideration, a few of the poorest beggars in the kingdom create the majority of our Legislators, while the men of most consideration, of most utility to the State, the merchants and manufacturers, are generally excluded. Construct the House of Commons,

tions, according to the ancient principles and practice of the Constitution, as manifested by the admission of Citizens and Burgesses to the National Councils; give every man of property, and none but men of property, a vote for Members of Parliament, and I am satisfied.

Mr. Young (p. 223.) gives the authority of Dr. Brady, to shew, that in ancient times, *liberi homines*, or free men, were those only who held in *capite*; and, throughout his whole book, he maintains, that landed proprietors were the only free men, and that they all had a right to vote for Representatives; that the other inhabitants were of no more account in the kingdom than the cows, sheep, and hogs, they drove; the artizans, manufacturers, labourers, &c. were all slaves and villains, and the privilege of sending Representatives, was a gracious donation from the King,—not a right of those to whom it was given; and in support of this he proves, that several Monarchs called Members to Parliament from obscure places. I have already shewn, that it was their right, according to the spirit and practice of the Constitution, which admitted all persons of consideration to send Representatives; and, it no more establishes the right of the Crown to bestow the privilege where it pleased, because it did so, than any other improper act establishes a right to do so. The selection of the towns as they grew into importance, being entrusted to the Crown, was, like many other trusts, abused by Kings, who, apprehensive of being in a minority in the Commons, summoned members from such places as they, or their creatures, could command; a desire to secure, or bring into office, some abject favourite Minister, probably, gave most of our rotten boroughs a right to send Representatives. Some of our former Sovereigns, unconstitutionally made Members of Parliament from similar motives with those which induced his present Majesty, constitutionally, to make so many Peers, in 1784:—to secure Mr. Pitt in power.

The

The assertion respecting tenants in *capite*, when properly examined, is more destructive to Mr. Young's object, than any other position in his book: For, admitting what he says to be true, which, I believe it pretty nearly is, that none were freemen, but proprietors of land, holding in *capite*, i. e. freeholders; and that all freeholders, or freemen, had a right to vote in the election of Members of Parliament, it follows that it is either a mockery to call the English a "*free* people," "a *free nation*," as he does (vide the note, p. 205) or an injustice, to withhold from them that right. He affirms, that formerly our mechanics, labourers, and manufacturers, &c. were all slaves and villains,—that they were of no more importance than cows and hogs;—admitted. But if they were slaves, were they free? The question must excite a smile.—They were slaves;—and if we are slaves also, then we have no right, upon the ancient principles of the Constitution, as laid down by Mr. Young, to petition for Reform.—But where is the man who dare come forward, and openly tell us we are slaves? What would be his fate?—What would be the indignation of every honest Englishman? Reeves and Young have indirectly told us this, but they have not had the audacity to speak roundly out. The fact is, that the present freedom of England was gradually extorted, sword in hand, from feudal sovereigns deriving their rights from the sword of a conqueror; nobly extorted. But had not the slaves and villains the greatest share in extorting it? And shall they who cemented it with their blood, be deprived of all its benefits? While we are attempting to make freemen of the blacks in the West Indies, shall we meanly suffer to be proved slaves ourselves? If it is true, as Mr. Young asserts, that in former times none were freemen but freeholders, and that all freeholders, or tenants in capite, were invested with the elective franchise, then it follows, that all freemen had a right to vote: If six hundred years ago the majority were

slaves,

slaves, are we not now all called freemen? Is not the Negro, who, sixty years ago, was a slave in this country, called a freeman? And if every freeman had formerly a right to vote for Representatives in Parliament, they who are now deprived of it, are, in that respect, still slaves and villains. But our ancestors struggled for, and bequeathed us freedom, though not perfect freedom: The elective franchise was the principal article that escaped them, and they overlooked it, because, it was not then of so much importance, nor was it so much abused as at present; they left to us the honour of atchieving it. Have we not equal virtue and perseverance? Shall we not imitate their example?

I am much surprised that Mr. Young, in describing the Constitution, did not discover and recommend a mode of constructing the House of Commons, which would be highly satisfactory to Government, which strongly resembles *his* theory of the ancient Parliaments, and is not quite unknown in the modern. As he asserts, that formerly none but tenants in capite, who held lands immediately of the Crown, had a right to sit in Parliament, or vote at elections, it might have occurred to him, that the ancient principles of the Constitution would be revived, if, instead of the right of election, and sitting in the House of Commons, being confined to those who held *lands* of the Crown, it were given to those who held *places*. Upon this plan of Reform, most of the Crown and Anchor committee, and even Mr. Young himself, might be entitled to a seat in Parliament.

" Historians are agreed as to the Parliament of " 1265, summoned by an usurper, being the origin " of the House of Commons," (p. 75) But (p. 216) Mr. Young contradicts this; he there quotes Sir Henry Spelman, and others, to shew, that in an hundred Parliaments *before* that period, the *boroughs* never were represented; implying thereby, that there *were* Knights of the Shire, though no Cititzens and Burgesses, which

is exactly what I agree to, and supports what I have said of the spirit and practice of the Constitution, which called to the National Council only men of consideration in the State. It is true, that prior to 1265, and even then, cities and boroughs were not represented, because their inhabitants were of little or no importance; the landed proprietors were the only men of importance in the kingdom, and therefore, the House of Commons was composed wholly of their Representatives. But as the cities and boroughs became of *consideration*, they also sent deputies. Nor is it just to conclude, (vide p. 217) because during the 200 years after the Norman conquest, the House of Commons was so insignificant as not to be mentioned by historians, that therefore, it never was assembled: It would be equally just to conclude, because we have no account of the meeting of every county court, and other institution of less importance, that therefore they did not at certain times assemble; or, because there is no history of the inhabitants in America, previous to its discovery by Columbus, that therefore, previous to that discovery, there were no inhabitants in that part of the world. And, even suppose the House of Commons were never assembled, during the 200 years alluded to, that does not prove it to have been unknown to the Constitution, more than abolishing the Trial by Jury, in certain cases, proves the Trial by Jury to be unknown to the Constitution. The existence of Representatives of some description, may be traced in every page of our history, and is coeval with all law and government in England. What, although they were occasionally laid aside, their rights invaded, or their construction varied, as suited the ambitious views of the Kings or Barons, that does not prove they had no right to assemble? On the contrary, wherever we find the slightest traces of the House of Commons, or wherever we find the most complete description and certainty of its existence and power, there

there is no mention of its being a *new* institution, which is strong proof that it was an *old* one; for is it possible, that so important a member of the Constitution could be created and introduced without some notice being taken of its novelty?

Another instance, not only of how far a Reform can be constitutionally made in the Representation, but also of its necessity, is the complete change in the spirit and sentiment of the House of Commons. The Constitution, formerly, supposed a continual jealousy of the Crown, and fellow feeling with the people, to exist in it; but now, and especially by Mr. Pitt, it has been made to repose a continual confidence in the Crown, and has shewn, particularly on the Russian Armament, that it has no fellow feeling with the people whatever. This dangerous reversal must arise from the reversal of the mode of rewarding the members, which is, also, a great and pernicious change: for, that Mr. Young's *salutary Corruption*, did not formerly exist, is plain, since the privilege of returning members, now so valuable, was then rather a burthen than a benefit; was then of so little importance, that many boroughs petitioned to be eased of it. To beget a jealousy of the Crown, and restore the ancient nationality of sentiment, in the House of Commons, is, therefore, not only constitutional, but the most wise and necessary measure for preserving the Freedom and Prosperity of the People.

How far it is constitutional to shorten the duration of Parliaments, does not require much investigation, because the facts relating to the question are of recent date, and clearly understood. Originally, Parliaments were only called for a particular purpose, and often sat only a few days: Sometimes there were two, but generally one new Parliament, in a year. In the seventeenth century, the usage varied, and was most grossly abused by the long Parliament, at last dissolved by Cromwell.

Yet, the vile precedent was approved, and imitated by the Kings who followed, and William the IIId. made it a great favour to agree to the Triennial Bill. The Septennial Bill is justified by Mr. Young, who says, " The Members of the House of Commons, when elected, and in combination with the other branches of the Legislature, assume and possess, and give themselves such powers and privileges, as rendered the septennial act just as constitutional as the biennial." That act, however, was by those who made it, justified only upon the exigency of the times, and ought to have been repealed when that exigency was past; but, without considering its legality, I shall remark, that, if Mr. Young's pernicious doctrine were true, there would not be the least security for the Liberties of the Nation: the three branches of the Legislature, in combination, might assume a power to repeal the Habeas Corpus Act, abolish the Trial by Jury, and the Liberty of the Press; give to the King's Proclamations the force of Law, as was done in the reign of Henry the VIIIth. and vesting the whole executive and legislative authority in the Crown, dissolve themselves for ever, and annihilate at once the Constitution and Freedom of Britain: This, according to Mr. Young, they might *constitutionally* do, by *assuming* powers and privileges; and, indeed, he seems desirous that they should do it, when he sets up as precedent, the example of Richard the IId. who dictated to the sheriffs, the names of those persons whom they should return to Parliament, and levied money without the consent of Parliament: Richard's fate, as well as Charles the First's, is well known. Were Mr. Young prime Minister, and his advice followed, he would probably occasion events, which no good man can wish to think of.

On the subject of the TIME for making a Reform, I can say nothing new. " To minds unwilling to do " right, all times are equally inconvenient and im-

" proper.

" proper. To him who dislikes the voyage, all the " winds of Heaven are unpropitious: He looks for " nothing but pretences to avoid it*." " This, " indeed, is a never failing argument, equally in " times of prosperity and adversity; in times of " War and Peace. If our situation happens to be " prosperous, it is then asked, whether we can be " more than happy or more than free? In the season " of adversity on the other hand, all Reform or In- " novation is deprecated, from the pretended risk " of increasing the evil and pressure of our situa- " tion. From all this, it would appear, that the " time for Reform never yet has come, and never can " come†." When, indeed, the arbitrary monarchy " of France, was battering down by the exertions " of a great people, and nothing was seen but vir- " tuous exertion and exultation, it might be ad- " mitted, that in such a conjuncture, men might " run before the mark, and confound principles to- " gether, which had no connection. Such was the " alledged, but not proved state of England, when " Mr. Grey gave notice last year of his motion. The " objection had then, therefore, at least, a *plausible*, " though not a just foundation. But, good God! " how different, on the admission of the objectors " to the times, was the present moment?" the English " Starting back with horror at the crimes and " calamities of France, and seemingly forgetting all " distresses in an enthusiasm for their own Govern- " ment! Surely common sense pronounced that to be " the hour for reformation, more especially when it was " left to themselves, (the House of Commons) to origi- " nate and to fashion it. So far from being urged on by " the people to go too far, they trod like men that feared " the ground would break under them, and could " hardly be brought up to the point which their under-

* Vide Mr. Francis's speech, May 7th.
† Vide Mr. Grey's speech, May 6th.

" standings

" standings dictated. Let them seize, therefore, " this happy and providential crisis, to do with po- " pularity and safety, what to save their country " must be done at last *." But, instead of embracing this favourable opportunity, every means is employed by Government to defeat the cause of Reform, and calumniate its advocates; and the present mode of constructing the House of Commons, will, probably, be continued until some dreadful convulsion happens, which may threaten the annihilation of the Constitution itself.

In considering what Reform should be made, I shall neither recommend nor reject any particular plan, being perfectly of opinion with Mr. Grey, that, to constitute the House of Commons by universal suffrage, or any other mode, which would make it more independant than at present, would be a most salutary improvement. Mr. Young says, the Society of the Friends of the People, approve of Universal Suffrage, because they assert that the House of Commons ought to be " *responsible to the People*;" —he interprets the word " People" to mean the whole Mass of the People, and here he exults in imagining he has proved that Society guilty of a *terrible enormity*. But he may as justly bring this *heinous* charge against his favourite, Mr. Burke, who never was an advocate for Reform, much less for Universal Suffrage; That Gentleman in his Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol maintains that Liberty is a general Principle, and must be extended to *all*; he likewise argues strongly in favour of the *Principle*, though he does not use the terms " Universal Suffrage," as may be seen in the Appendix; Mr. Pitt also resolved to take the *sense of the whole People* in his Resolutions at the Thatched House Tavern, and the King in his speeches, about the time of the conclusion of the American War, repeatedly declared, that his only wish was to act for the good of his *People*, for whose benefit alone he

* Mr. Erskine's speech, May 6th.

was

was vested with authority. Here then are facts upon which Mr. Young may accuse his Majesty, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Burke, of contending for Universal Suffrage, and of being Jacobins, as justly as he has accused the Friends of the People. But as that Society never have adopted any plan, it will be more in point to examine the one proposed by the most violent leader of the most violent society in Britain.—For such, I believe, Mr. Horne Tooke, and the Constitutional Society, are deemed by Mr. Young, and those who think with him.

Mr. Horne Tooke, in his letter to Lord Ashburton, when he, and Mr. Pitt, Sir James Sanderson, Mr. Frost, and the Duke of Richmond, were joint Reformers, so far from approving universal suffrage, recommends a plan of Reform, perfectly agreeing with the ideas of those gentlemen, who say, the House of Commons is a Representation of Property; for he makes it the governing power in electing the Representatives of the people. He maintains, that although all men may have a right to a share, yet they have not all a right to an *equal* share in this choice; for, says he, "There is a very great difference between an *equal right* to a share, and a "right to an *equal share*. An estate may be devised, by "will, among many persons, in different proportions; to one five pounds, to another five hundred, "&c. each person will have an equal right to his "share, but not a right to an equal share."

"This principle," (continues Mr. Tooke, alluding to universal suffrage) "is further attempted to be "enforced by an assertion, that *the all of one man "is as dear to him, as the all of another man is to that "other*. But this maxim will not hold by any means; "for a small is not, for very good reasons, so dear "as a great all. A small all may be lost, and very "easily regained; it may very often, and with great "wisdom, be risked for the chance of a greater; it "may be so small, as to be little or not at all "worth defending or caring for. But a large all can

"never

" never be recovered; it has been amassing and ac-
" cumulating, perhaps, from father to son, for many
" generations; or it has been the product of a long
" life of industry and talents; or the consequence of
" some circumstance which will never return. Jus-
" tice and policy require, that benefit and burthen,
" that the share of power, and the share of contri-
" bution to that power, should be as nearly propor-
" tioned as possible." Thus far Mr. Tooke speaks against the *equality of right* to a share in the Representation: He then speaks of the impolicy of making the elective franchise *universal*. " Freedom and secu-
" rity ought surely to be equal and universal;" (says
" he) but the members of a society may be *free* and *se-*
" *cure*, without having a share in the Government.
" *The happiness and freedom, and security of the whole;*
" *may even be advanced by the* EXCLUSION *of* SOME,
" *not from freedom and security, but from a share in the*
" *Government.*" Mr. Tooke then enumerates the classes which ought to be excluded, and which certainly are the majority, as they comprise " the ex-
tremely miserable," " extremely dependent, " ex-
" tremely ignorant," and " extremely selfish."

His plan of constructing the House of Commons is, that the kingdom should be divided into 513 districts, each of which should send a member: that none should vote who were not assessed in two pounds to the parish rates, or land tax; that Parliaments should be annual; that every elector at the time of giving his vote, should pay two guineas, to be appropriated to the use of the nation; and, that where the number of electors fell short of 4000, those might vote over again, in proportion as they were assessed, and repeat their vote as often as was necessary to complete the number of 4000, still paying two guineas for each vote. By this plan, a landholder, paying a large land-tax, might probably, have the privilege of giving one hundred votes, upon paying two hundred guineas. What plan would give the predominating influence in the choice

of

of Representatives, more completely into the hands of men of property than this? According to it, property would be *truly* represented, because none but men of *some* property are assessed to the amount of two pounds to the parish rates, or land tax: And even if universal suffrage were established, yet the circumstance of paying annually two guineas, for the privilege of voting, would effectually exclude the majority, who are poor, and would still give the ruling influence in elections to men of property.

Such is the Reform proposed by Mr. Horne Tooke, a leader, if not *the* leader, of a society which Mr. Young describes to be much more violent than the Friends of the People; and, if that society are called more dangerous than the latter, and yet it appears, the object of their leader is so moderate, it is surely unnecessary to vindicate the Friends of the People from the charge of entertaining mischievous views, since Mr. Young admits them to be more moderate than the constitutional society. I here think it necessary to remark, that the epithet, violent, applied to the constitutional society, is merely Mr. Young's, not mine.

Compare Mr. Tooke's plan of Reform with that proposed by a principal conductor of the present war, and consequently a partizan and favourite of Mr. Young, I mean the Duke of Richmond. His Grace contended for personal Representation in its *fullest extent*, and his co-adjutors* were Mr. Pitt, Lord Kenyon, and the leaders of the present Administration; yet it is strange, that the Duke and his friends, who first recommended personal Representation, and who truly have founded the societies in favour of that measure, and the petitions which lately prayed for it, escape the censure of those who ascribe every mischief to their doctrine; and it is still more strange

* I do not mean to say, that Mr. Pitt, Lord Kenyon, &c. contended for universal suffrage, but as they acted cordially with those who did, they are equally guilty, according to Mr. Young's reasoning.

that such as Mr. Tooke, who are *decidedly against* personal Representation should be loaded with obloquy!

From what I have stated, therefore, it appears, that Mr. Tooke's plan agrees with the ancient spirit and practice of the Constitution, which recognized only *men of consideration in the State* as having a right to a share in the great National Council; and that the Duke of Richmond's plan agrees perfectly with Mr. Young's original Theory of the Constitution, which gave every freeman a right to vote, and consequently, now, must make the elective franchise universal, since there are no slaves, but all are freemen in Britain.

For my own part, I think, the true object of a Reform is, not to give every man his natural right of a vote, but to make the House of commons independent of the executive power, or of a small number of wealthy men, and to make it act upon an identity of interest with the people. The manner in which this would be best accomplished, should, in my opinion, be the rule of a Reform. Mr. Fox said truly, that the object of a Reform of Parliament ought to be the collection of the greatest number, not simply of wills, but of *independent* wills: and Montesquieu was of the same opinion; for, in speaking of the British Constitution, he says, it is necessary in a free Government that every man should have a suffrage who can be supposed to have *a will of his own.* I therefore agree with Mr. Tooke, that the happiness of the whole may be advanced by the exclusion of some, not from happiness, but from the elective franchise, because, a great manufacturer or landholder, or any other person, who employed, or could control, the extremely miserable, extremely dependent, or extremely ignorant, might influence them to vote as he pleased, and thereby acquire an undue power in elections, and invade the independence of the Legislature; for I conceive, that, universal suffrage, would render the miserable and

selfish

selfish electors liable to be corrupted, the ignorant liable to be misled, and the dependent liable to be commanded. These classes would generally, if not always, form the majority at elections, and consequently, those candidates who possessed wealth, eloquence, or control, might procure themselves to be returned, although their conduct in Parliament had previously been injurious to the national welfare, and even displeasing to the independent national judgment.

It is asked, by Mr. Young, as the journeymen mechanics, manufacturers, and labourers, never voted at elections, what right have they to petition for Reform; and they themselves may join in saying, if, according to Mr. Tooke's plan, we are not to vote, why, indeed, should we petition for Reform? To this, I answer, it is as much their interest to make exertions in favour of Reform, as it is the interest of those who would be vested with the elective franchise, which is, in itself, of no value to those who possess it, but like the delegation, ought to be entrusted to those who would exercise it with most wisdom and independence; and as wisdom and independence prevail more certainly in the middling ranks, than in the whole mass of the people, the elective franchise, should, in my opinion, be confined to them; and I repeat, that it is as much the interest of those who would not, as of those who would have votes, that a Reform should take place, and even that the elective franchise should be so confined, because the benefits that would flow from a Representative body so constructed, would be general, and the poor, as well as the rich, would equally partake of them.

If, indeed, men were to be guided wholly by natural right, and fully to insist upon the maxim, that no man is bound by laws to which he has not given consent, it would come to this, that all men in the kingdom must assemble personally to form the Legislative Assembly; and this was pretty nearly the

case in ancient times. But the system of delegation was adopted, not only for the sake of convenience, but because, the wisest, and most independent men, in whom the whole mass could confide, were appointed to make laws, and by the smallness of their number, were enabled to act with deliberation and sound judgment. If, therefore, the ancient great National Council was thus narrowed, for the sake of convenience, wisdom, and independence, why should not the construction of the modern National Council be also, either narrowed or extended to those limits, which are most likely to insure convenience, wisdom, independence, and impartiality? If the right is surrendered, in one instance, to procure certain objects, why should it not be surrendered in another, if by that other surrender those objects are more firmly secured?

This will be further illustrated by the Trial by Jury. The privilege of serving on Juries, which certainly is of a more clear and immediate value, than a vote for a Representative, is not universal, but is confined to householders and landholders, yet it is as much the natural right of every man as the elective franchise. And what is the reason we never heard of petitions and associations for extending to all men the privilege of serving on Juries? Because all men are satisfied, that by the principle, it is sufficiently distributed, (however, it may be secretly abused in practice,) to render Juries independent and impartial; and because, the poor labourer, or mechanic, although he knows he can never serve on a Jury, while he is neither a housekeeper nor a landholder, is, nevertheless, convinced that justice is as amply secured by those who do serve, as if the privilege were universal, and therefore, he does not associate or petition to extend it; yet he is as much interested in preserving it to householders and landholders, as if he himself were a householder or landholder; and if the elective franchise were as generally distributed, as the privilege of serving

ing on Juries, we should neither have associations of the rich or the poor, for reforming Parliament.

But while I agree in opinion with Mr. Tooke, that the middling class of society, should elect the Members of Parliament, I am far from agreeing with him in the mode of election. There should be no such condition as that of paying two guineas at the time of voting, nor should any man be permitted to vote more than once.

From what I have now said, I think, a Reform is necessary; that the elective franchise should either be given *exclusively* to men of consideration, or universally to *all men*, (for, to me, it is immaterial, whether it is possessed by all, or a part, if the Representative Body is independent;) that the present time is peculiarly favourable for making a Reform; that Parliaments ought to be annual, and that the Representatives ought to be liberally paid by their Constituents for their attendance. The means of preventing riots and corruption at elections, and making many other inferior regulations, are simple and obvious.

Nor are we to dread innovation, for, while he deprecates the destruction of "extravagant Courts, selfish "Ministers, and corrupt Majorities," Mr. Young says, that "to declare against any measure, because, "an innovation is a conduct worthy of children. It "is not for or against innovation, but what the na- "ture of the innovation shall be." Admitting then, the removal of corruption by Reform, to be an innovation, is it not a more laudable one than that which Mr. Young advises, the establishment of a national militia of property, to stifle the complaints and hold in bondage their fellow Citizens of no property? He cautions against taking away from the machine of Government, a rotten wheel, which all men, not excepting himself, have directly or indirectly condemned, and yet desires the addition of a new one, which no man of sound sense can approve. But he may be assured, his advice will not be followed by Government.

ment *. The Crown will never part with the control over the military. During the American War, it found the consequences of putting arms into the hands of the people in Ireland; and although, men of property prostrate themselves before the Throne at present, yet it is obvious, they will not always continue in the same humour, because, their property marks them out as the prey of taxation. When their ridiculous fears are over, they will regard Government with a jealous eye, and if armed and disciplined, might probably make both Reforms and Revolutions; might destroy selfish Ministers, and root out Corruption. Men of property are not only more intelligent, but more interested in the government of this country, than men of no property, and therefore are more likely to interfere in its conduct, and thwart its favourite measures. It is not from an opinion of the wisdom of our rulers, that the rich at present support them, but from a dread, insidiously excited, that their property is in danger from the designs of those who oppose the Government. When this unfounded dread is past, they will be equally displeased with " extravagant Courts, selfish Ministers, and cor-" rupt Majorities," for invading their property, as they now are, with the Friends to Liberty, from a mistaken notion that they meditate its destruction.

* The augmentation of the internal force of the kingdom, as recommended by Government, in their letter of the 14th of March, does not at all contradict this assertion. One description of cavalry is, indeed, to consist of the Gentlemen and Yeoman, or *such persons as they shall bring forward:* But this is no more than the common Militia, which is always understood to consist of the Gentlemen and Yeomanry, *or such persons as they bring forward.* Under this last condition the " Beggars without a shilling" are brought forward as substitutes; and the contents of the circular letter from Government clearly shews, that the whole of these volunteer corps, officers excepted, are expected to be composed of these " beggars."—Therefore Mr. Young's proposed plan of having a National Militia of Property, to the exclusion of the " beggars," *unfortunately* for the country, is not yet adopted.

The

The same motive, which now makes them afraid to innovate, (the preservation of property) will, hereafter make them clamorous for political œconomy,—for Reform. Government knows this well, and therefore, it will depend for support on the " Slaves and " villains," on the " Beggars without a shilling," rather than on the opulent, who soon might be disposed to make elections for Members of Parliament, and dictate to Government, " at the point of the " bayonet." If then, the House of Commons, is at all a good institution, and an evil does exist in it, are we not to ascribe the birth of that evil to the deviation from its principles, professions, and original practice? And how shall we expel the evil but by bringing it nearer to these?—This is Reform; and the moment we deviate from it, a dread of innovation becomes justifiable, lest it may be carried too far. But no such dread can reasonably be entertained while improvement is confined to the original practice, the principles, and present professions of the House of Commons, because a limit is marked out, beyond which it is impossible for Parliamentary *Reform* to go.

Mr. Young says (p. 81), that " the people never " had the power of changing the Constitution *with-* " *out being in its perpetual exercise.*" This is like his other falsehoods; for it is plain the people *always* have the *Power*, though not always the *right*; and the " Practice" ſhews the fallacy of what he would inculcate, that if they began Reform they would always be altering. " People are not so easily got " out of their old forms as some are apt to suggest. " They are hardly to be prevailed with to amend the " acknowledged faults in the frame of Government " they have been accustomed to. And if there be " any original defects, or adventitious ones intro- " duced by time or corruption, it is not an easy " thing to get them changed, even when all the

" world

" world sees there is an opportunity for it *." The history of all countries, particularly of this, shews, that the people are never eager to change their form of Government. A memorable and recent instance of this is on record. At the conclusion of the American War, the whole blame of which was thrown on the Corruption of the House of Commons, and when as many approved of Reform as at this time dread it, so fearful were the people of forcing Government, or so little inclined to interfere, that there were not so many signatures affixed to the petitions, praying Parliamentary Reform, as there were last spring. If the people are naturally fickle, why did they not come forward on that occasion? The fact is quite the contrary to what Mr. Young affirms, and just as Mr. Locke states it. History shews us, that Governors have generally, if not always, altered Governments for the worse, and that the people have always altered them for the better. I except the case of France, the experiment having neither had time nor opportunity to be made there; and indeed Mr. Young acknowledges, that the important transactions in that unhappy country have been effected, not by the people, but by the *Government*, by the *terror* produced by a very *small minority*.

I have declined pointing out any of the abuses in the present mode of conducting elections, or shewing the absurd manner in which the elective franchise is distributed, because these subjects, and several others, are so ably treated in the Petition and Reports of the Friends of the People; nor do I think it necessary to reply to all Mr. Young's ridiculous animadversions on those publications. He says (p. 84), " You state the Parliamentary Influence of the Earl " of Lonsdale, Lords Elliot, Edgecumbe, &c. you " state a fact; but (p. 81) with this system of in- " fluence, which seems Corruption to the eye of ig-

* Locke's Essay on Government.

" norance,

" norance, the liberties the people have been con-
" stantly improving;—we are happy under the Go-
" vernment of Influence, how then can it be bad?"
—He might as fairly say, " You state the crimes of Barrington, Hubbard, and other highwaymen; you state a fact;—but with their system of livelihood, which seems robbery in the eye of ignorance, the liberties of the people have been constantly improving. We are happy, though contributions are made on Hounslow-Heath, how then can they be bad?" Corruption, as I have already said, is a bad part of a good system, and ought to be removed. And, though I by no means blame, or allude to the Noblemen above-mentioned, yet, I have no doubt, that transactions take place relative to Parliamentary Influence, which I, being an ignorant person, deem Corruption, that not only deserve, but if publicly proved, would, for the sake of decency, be as rigorously punished as any offence committed on Hounslow-Heath *. And we might, with equal justice ascribe, our happiness to the robberies committed there, as to the influence, which, according to Mr. Young, the ignorant think Corruption in the House of Commons.

But this boasted happiness is, I fear, much overcoloured. Those who can buy a three-and-sixpenny pamphlet indeed, the shopkeepers and merchants of the City of London, the members of country cor-

* I will not, however, be too positive in this remark, for I was present when a very rich man of the name of Smith was, on the testimony of several others, committed for gross perjury, by a Committee which was trying a contested election for Exeter in 1791, before which he had been examined as a witness. I soon afterwards saw, by the Newgate Calender, that he was imprisoned by virtue of the Speaker's warrant, to take his trial at the Old-Bailey for perjury. But by some means, which I could never learn, perhaps by Mr. Young's salutary influence, he was speedily brought before the House, reprimanded, and discharged; nor, although it was then hinted, that he was yet to be punished, has any punishment been inflicted!!!

porations, and all who possess the means of living easily, may well say, they are happy; but they should not take upon them to answer for the whole nation*. Do these men comprise the whole people? No. Not a tenth, perhaps not a fiftieth part of the people. Yet, as they are more intelligent, conspicuous, and noisy, in the world, they certainly make a great appearance. My unfashionable idea of *the people*, however, comprises the Swinish Multitude, as well as the men of some property.

I shall not enter into an abstract definition of happiness. If it is presumed, that acquiescence in a state is a proof of happiness, then the Turks and Tartars, and the West-India slaves, are happy, and it would be impolitic to improve their condition or reform the Constitutions under which they live. And it will be found, that what is deemed happiness in Britain is mere submission, arising, not from an enjoyment of the comforts of life, but from the ignorance of the lower class of people; an ignorance, which Mr. Young recommends to be perpetuated and increased; and, indeed, it is a sure way of bestowing what some men mean by happiness; for how can a man regret the want of that to which he has never been accustomed? Had the inhabitants of this country been always confined to such happiness, they might now have been no better off than they were under William the Conqueror, or than the present wretched natives of Morocco. The diffusion of knowledge has been a chief cause of the superior degree of happiness enjoyed by the British subjects;

* A Farmer-General in Languedoc, who received as much money from the old French as Mr. Reeves now does from the English Government, was told many years ago, when Reform might have been made without being followed by any mischievous consequences, how necessary it was to retrench and amend the mode of carrying on the Government; to which, like our pensioners, he answered, *Mais pourquoi changer? Nous sommes si bien.* —But why change! We are so well.

but

but this happiness cannot be interpreted to be acquiescence, or a blind and ignorant content, because then the wild savages of America are happier than the most wealthy classes in Britain. It must be interpreted, prosperity, or a superior degree of enjoyment in the necessaries and comforts of life, and in the civilized intercourse of society. By this rule, therefore, we muſt judge of it; for otherwise, we shall find the most wretched beings content in the midst of want, and the most wealthy and prosperous discontented in the midst of plenty.

If, then, we decide on the happiness of the people at large in Britain, not by what may chance to make them acquiescent, but by what rationally ought to make them content, we shall find their happiness to consist chiefly in the assertions of those who really possess that, and in the ignorance of those who do not. That which *ought* to give content, and consequently constitutes happiness, is, I conceive, a plenty of good food and clothing, of all the necessaries of life, to such a degree, as would make every man and his family comfortable. How far that is the case * I will leave any man to judge, who can impartially, and with some intelligence on the subject, compare all classes in his neighbourhood. He must not confine himself to the Royal-Exchange, to Grosvenor-

* Mr. Pitt in opening the Budget on the 5th of February last, said, that the usual allowance of £.4 per month, per man, to seamen had been found to fall short about nine shillings per month, and that to answer the deficiency, £.500,000 must be added to the Navy Extraordinaries. This plainly ascertains that the lowest expence of maintaining *one single Man*, with every advantage of having his victuals bought in large quantities and by contract, *must be* 1l. 2s. 3d. per week. But if the *happy* Millions of Mechanics and Labourers with all the disadvantage of buying their morsels in small quantities, and of paying for lodging, firing, taxes, &c. and supporting a wife and many children, attempts to raise his wages to the sum which Mr. Pitt confesses to be the least upon which a *single Man* can subsist, he is thrown into goal for a conspiracy, and Mr. Young maintains that to be the best way of treating those *happy* "Beggars without a shilling."

Square, or Mr. Young's parlour; but let him examine the large towns, the manufacturers, mechanics, and country labourers, and he will find an immense majority of the people, who are not so well provided with the necessaries of life, as the paupers in a workhouse. Even in London, the most wealthy spot in the empire, I will venture to affirm, that a great majority are not comfortably provided with the common necessaries of life; and that if those, who are comfortably provided, are compared with those who are in want, I believe, the latter will out-number the former. So much for the general happiness enjoyed by the people in this country. Mr. Young, when feasting on venison and claret with the Committee of Pensioners in the Crown and Anchor Tavern, might well exclaim, "Are not we a happy "people?"—But were he to go into the regions of Spitalfields, where he might seat himself among many thousands who want a morsel of bread to put in their mouths, and say the same thing, he would provoke the indignation of every feeling man, and even Mr. Reeves, I hope, would blush at his impudence*.

But

* It is rather singular, that formerly the most pompous eulogiums were always made on our government, and happiness, by those who most rapaciously plundered the People, while they were violating the principles not only of freedom, but of common justice. The following extract from Henry's History of Britain, p. 183-4, vol. vi. quarto edition, is one strong instance of this: "The King," (Henry VIII. in 1543) "had borrowed great "sums from a prodigious multitude of his subjects, of all ranks, "for the repayment of which, he had given bonds and other le-"gal securities. The Parliament, very generously, made the "King a present of all the money he had borrowed from his sub-"jects, and declared his bonds and securities to be of no value. "The King thanked his two houses in the politest terms, for "their generosity, and graciously accepted their valuable present, "while his creditors were left to condole with one another, and "put up with their losses, as well as they could. *The preamble "to this iniquitous statute, is one of the most extravagant pieces of "flattery that ever was composed.* In it they gave a *mournful de-"scription* of the *confusion, poverty, distress,* and *misery,* of ALL "OTHER

But, admitting the eulogiums on our happiness to be just, will not their truth be the greatest aggravation of the conduct of those who pronounce them, and yet plunge us from this elevated felicity into all the miseries of the most unnecessary calamitous War that ever afflicted Europe? In the same proportion as they extol our happiness, they increase their own criminality, by depriving us of it: And it is in vain to say, that the War was unavoidable, or, that it was provoked by the French, for though a majority of people insist on these two points, yet a candid examination of facts, will shew, that they have no other foundation than the prejudices of those who believe them.

I have already shewn, that hostilities were resolved on by Austria, long before they were meditated by France, who did all in her power to prevent them. And although Mr. Young asserts, that "this country had no right to interfere in the affairs of France, previous to the 10th of August, and that till then

"OTHER NATIONS, and drew a very *flattering picture* of the "*riches, peace*, and *prosperity*, of England, *during his Grace's* "*reign.*"——Judge Jeffries, in the memorable trial of Lady Lisle, spoke thus to the jury. "Besides, gentlemen, we cannot "be sufficiently thankful to our God, for the mercies we enjoyed "under that blessed King (Charles the IId.) for, we are to "consider, that we lived in all the affluence of peace and plenty; "*our Lives, Liberties, and Properties, inviolably were secured*; "*every man sat safe under the shadow of his own vine, and ate the* "*fruit of his own labour*. And while our neighbours suffered the "calamities of War, we were surrounded with all the blessings "of Peace, and slept securely under the government of a gra-"cious and merciful King."——The Lord Justice Clerk, on the late trial of Mr. Muir, spoke in substance precisely the same. The only material difference arose from his natural *aversion* to inebriety, which induced him to convert Judge Jeffries' intoxicating vine into a sober fig-tree. He said, "It requires no "proof to shew, that the British Constitution is the best that ever "was since the creation of the world, and it is not possible to "make it better: *for is not every man secure? Does not every man* "*reap the fruits of his own industry, and sit safely under his own* "*fig-tree!*"

"our

" our Government was rather friendly than other-
" wise," yet it will easily be shewn, that he is quite mistaken, (unless he means such friendship as the Duke of Brunswick's,) and that the War might, and ought to have been avoided, as the French were even more desirous of keeping peace with Britain, than they had been to prevent a rupture with Austria.

Our Government, indeed, observed a strict neutrality previous to the 10th of August, but not from any good will towards France. It was the dread of the resentment of the British people, and the belief, that the Duke of Brunswick would effect his purpose without our assistance, that prevented Administration from openly joining the concert of Princes in their first operations. Sufficient proof of this was on record before the 10th of August, and subsequent events have set the fact beyond all dispute. The hostile disposition of the Court of St. James's, towards the French Constitution, was believed all over Europe, and never even questioned in England. The French knew and avowed it; but they relied on the love of Liberty inherent in Englishmen, for defeating the designs of Government against their Freedom: And for a while, this notion of a difference of sentiment, between the King's Ministers and the people, seemed to be justly founded.

Mr. Burke denounced the French Revolution previous to the abolition of titles, and before so much blood had been shed as lately was spilt in Bristol, about the payment of a halfpenny: He has continued his furious Anathemas; and long before the 10th of August, was feasted at the cabinet dinners of our Ministers, and caressed by that Monarch, whom he had declared the Almighty to have hurled from his Throne; whose household expences he had curtailed, and whose displeasure was well known, in consequence, to have been incurred. What then was the cause of Mr. Burke becoming so great a favourite, if it was not his abuse of the French Revolution? Was this

a sympton

a symtom of our Government being rather friendly than otherwise?

In the summer of 1791, when our Government knew that the German Princes were planning a War against France, did not a newspaper, notoriously in the pay of certain persons high in office, teem with the most artful falsehoods and gross calumnies, for the purpose of deterring the admirers of the French Revolution from celebrating that event on the 14th of July, or of producing a riot which might disgrace the meeting? Did not a mob assemble round the Crown and Anchor Tavern, London, which, thanks to their own discretion and good intentions, rather than to those who attempted to dupe them into violence, dispersed without doing any mischief? Did not a similar mob assemble in Birmingham, which committed the most horrid excesses for the honour of Church and King? Was not that mob instigated by persons, who supposed they were pleasing and serving the Government, and do they not yet remain unpunished? But from these events, can any thing be discovered in the conduct of our Cabinet, that shewed it to be 'rather "friendly to the French Revolution than other-"wise?" A politician would have formed his opinion of the sentiments of our Government from the contents of such a newspaper, because, it would not dare to take a side on a question of such magnitude and continuance, *against* the will of its patrons; and, through its channel, Administration might inculcate such doctrines as it might be impolitic to avow. In such a newspaper, they speak in the dark; they assert what they please, without being responsible, or known, or even, perhaps, suspected. The public look for the printer's name at the bottom, to see who is the author of the contents, when, probably, it would be more just to look to the vicinity of Whitehall.

Mr. Pitt himself, in the debate on Mr. Grey's notice of his motion for a Parliamentary Reform, three months before the 10th of August, called the

French

French Constitution, such, as if formed in the morning, could not exist till noon. He also reprobated the wild French theories, which, he said, were subversive of all order and government, and although he did not preach War against France, yet he countenanced those who did, and condemned as dangerous every principle of the Revolution: Nor did any member of Administration ever hint that they disapproved of Mr. Burke's war-whoop.

Was the conduct of our Ministers in declining to negociate between France and Austria, in favour of Peace, when solicited to that effect by the former, no proof that they wished to see a War? Was the balance of power in danger by the Empress of Russia's retaining possession of Oczakow, and in no danger by the combined armies gaining poſſeſſion of Paris, for such was then the expectation? Could we go to War about a single remote town, and yet refuse to negociate, when the existence of a great neighbouring nation was in question? "But we had no right to interfere, unless called "upon by all the parties *."—No! Then we have no right to interfere in behalf of Poland, unless called upon by the Empress of Russia; then, we had no right to interfere about Oczakow, in behalf of the Turks, because the same gracious Dame did not call upon us; and we have no right now to interfere in behalf of the French Royalists, because, the Republicans do not call upon us!—We had a right:—it was our duty. We might have preserved a limited Monarchy in France, averted the dreadful calamities of the present War, and saved an amiable unfortunate King from the scaffold.

Another pointed instance of the secret hostility of our Government towards the new Constitution of France is to be found in the correspondence which passed between Lord Grenville and Mons. Chauvelin, in May, 1792. The latter, invariably stiles Louis the XVIth. "King of the French," which was the

* Vide Lord Grenville's note to Mons. Chauvelin.

title

title decreed by the National Assembly, and the former as invariably stiles him, " His Most Christian " Majesty," which was the title during the Despotism. Thus, the British Government, three months before the 10th of August, fully manifested its unwillingness to acknowledge the new Constitution: It was manifested in the same manner, as was afterwards openly declared, on refusing to acknowledge the Republic; in distinctions of names and forms, and betrayed a sympathy, at least, if not an actual connection, with the Duke of Brunswick. If to this, we add the uncontradicted passage in the Declaration of the French Princes, on the 10th of September, 1791, wherein the King of France is " assured, that *every* power in Europe," (among which, Britain must be included) " is favourable to the enterprise of the " Duke of Brunswick," and the very warm reception, both at Court and by Ministers, of that public plunderer, Calonne, it would be the height of folly to question the regret of our Cabinet, at the fall of the old French Government, and the ardent desire for its restoration.

In addition to these proofs, which existed previous to the 10th of August, of the unfriendly disposition of the British Court to the French Revolution, others have occurred since that period, which illustrate and confirm my opinion of the secret hostility of our Ministers, and fully contradict Mr. Young's assertion, that, " till then, our Government was rather friendly " than otherwise."

Mr. Pitt declared, in the House of Commons last winter, " That as a right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Fox) " had rejoiced at the retreat of the Duke of Brunswick, so he, on his part, would say, he considered " it as the greatest misfortune that could have be- " fallen mankind." Lord Auckland, in his Memorial to the States General, dated Jan. 25th, thus expresses himself, when speaking of France: " It is not " *quite four years* since certain *miscreants*, assuming the

" name of Philosophers, have presumed to think " themselves capable of establishing a new system of " civil society." Lord Hood, in his first proclamation to the people of Toulon, not only has imitated Lord Auckland, in alluding to " the misery which " for *four* years has afflicted France," but declared, " that it is for the *re-establishment of the French Mo-* " *narchy*, that Britain has armed." But, indeed, the late Proclamation of his Majesty, sets the fact beyond dispute, that we are fighting to give a Government to France, and is therefore, strong presumptive proof of the hostile disposition of our Court, previous to the 10th of August, and, combined with other circumstances, fairly justifies us in concluding, that it was only the fear of discontent at home *, and the confidence that our exertions were unnecessary, which prevented us from being more early engaged in the War.

Much proof cannot be required of the unfriendly disposition of our Court after the 10th of August. Withdrawing our Ambassador, and refraining to send another, was an unequivocal demonstration of displeasure, and a sure presage of hostility. The scandalous and incessant abuse of Mons. Chauvelin, in a newspaper (the Sun) conducted by persons connected with, and at the devotion of Administration, was surely some ground for supposing there were those who wished to drive him from this country, and thereby precipitate a War. The French, on the other hand, strongly evinced their desire to preserve Peace with England by continuing Mons. Chauvelin at our Court, after the British Ambassador was with-

* Mr. Burke, a few days before the declaration of hostilities, said, in the House of Commons, " that he only pardoned the Mi- " nisters for their slowness in beginning the War, on account of " the necessity of waiting till the public temper was inflamed to " a sufficient pitch to second them effectually. For nearly four " years he had been waiting for that fortunate period, which had " at last arrived."

drawn

drawn from Paris: This was an instance of humiliation, which, even amidst all their successes, exultation, and pride, they submitted to, in hopes of maintaining tranquillity: And among others, equally unquestionable, may be enumerated, the refusal of giving permission to Dumourier, to enter Holland, who, in a council at Liege, on the 5th of December, affirmed, that he could easily march to Amsterdam, and destroy the Dutch Government, if he received orders for that purpose. The Executive Council, however, would not give him any such orders, for fear of provoking a rupture with Britain; a conduct which they, no doubt, soon repented, as they saw by the stoppage of corn, the alien bill, and the speeches of Ministers in Parliament, how unfounded was their expectation of continuing Peace: They saw, that the antipathy of the British Government to their Revolution, which had been manifested from the beginning, and had gradually increased and displayed itself, was at last, going to break out into open War. The King's death gave a plausible pretext for dismissing Chauvelin, and by provoking the indignation of Englishmen, prepared their feelings to plunge into a War of vengeance; for such it certainly was on the part of the British people, even in its outset.

With regard to the professed grounds of commencing the War; the decree of fraternity, the opening the Scheldt, and the aggrandizement of France, they have not only been so amply discussed, but as they have long ceased to exist, it would be superfluous in me to animadvert on them; and, as was often said in Parliament, there can be little doubt that they might have been amicably settled, if a pacific disposition had been manifested by our Ministers, and if they had entered into a proper negociation. They, indeed, pretended, that the French had given in their ultimatum, but our Ministers have shewn, that when it suited their purpose, they could consider ultimatums only as preliminaries; for, in the

late dispute with Spain, they appeared as anxious to avoid, as, with France, they since appeared eager to precipitate a rupture.

Such were the pretexts for commencing the War: Its * real grounds, the subsequent conduct of Ministers, has fully illustrated; they have shewn that Mr. Young was right in saying, its object was to destroy a combination of Reformers. Thus, then, according to the late Earl of Chatham and Sir George Saville, the American War was begun in order to gratify the Corruption of the House of Commons, and according to Mr. Young, the present War is to preserve its rotten Constitution. Indeed, Mr. Young's opinion is confirmed by every circumstance; for, was not the late alarm directed wholly against Reform? Was not the proclamation, in May 1792, produced in consequence of the society of the Friends of the People being instituted for the purpose of procuring a Reform? What could be the object of that proclamation, if it was not to excite an alarm against Reform? Did it not immediately divide the kingdom into Reformers and Anti-Reformers? Was it not the avowed determination of Government to resist Reform, and the dread, that in the conflict, the Constitution would be destroyed, that first founded the alarm? It was from the speeches of those in power, from proclamations, camps, and addresses, that the kingdom first began to think itself in danger. In the same manner as the popularity of the American War was planned in, and directed by the secret Cabinet, was the late alarm planned and directed by the tools of Government. Alarms have always been found useful to those who profit by "ex-" travagant Courts, selfish Ministers, and corrupt

* Mr. Bowles, one of the Crown and Anchor committee, in his "Real Grounds," published last winter, says, it is merely on our part a War of *Defence*, and that no country has a right to interfere in the internal concerns of another.

"Majorities." The alarm excited by the riots in 1780, destroyed all hopes of a Reform at that time; and the alarm at the conclusion of 1792, has again defeated, for the present, the same cause. Thus we find, that alarms will always be hatched, when Parliamentary Reform is likely to succeed, and yet, that the want of that Reform brought on the American War, the most ruinous this country ever saw, and has involved us in another, the consequences of which cannot be calculated, although they threaten to be much more dreadful.

After a period was put to negociation, excepting some underhand intercourse, which, it would appear, Ministers entered into merely to give a colour to an affected desire of Peace; after the dismissal of Chauvelin, what was to be expected?—War.—His dismissal was an unequivocal mark of hostility on our part, for so such a step has always been considered by nations in similar circumstances, and, accompanied with the other aggravating acts of our Government, rendered a rupture inevitable. The office, then, of commencing the War was thrown upon the French, who, it was not to be supposed, amidst their successes, would betray a dastardly fear, by declining it: It was not to be expected that they would then shrink from a War with a country, which shewed it would begin the attack as soon as it could with advantage, and which had cut off all chance of the continuance of Peace, by driving away the Ambassador. Yet Mr. Dundas had the assurance to declare, in the House of Commons, that the War, on our part, was simply defensive! A declaration which he could only have been encouraged to make by the ready belief then given to whatever was said in support of Government. He might as justly have declared, that the seizure of Poland was simply defensive on the part of Russia and Prussia; and, indeed, those powers made that their pretext; they said, they divided

Poland

Poland in order to defend themselves against Jacobinism!

War, however, being commenced, it is not so important at present to investigate its original pretexts, as to enquire what are now its real objects, how long it is likely to continue, and what will probably be its termination and consequences. Upon the first of these points there are as various opinions as there are about religion: Some are for fighting to restore the ancient Monarchy, and exterminate the present popular principles; others, desire the restoration of the Constitution, founded in 1789; a third party, support the War in hopes of gaining territory; a fourth, wish the throat of every Frenchman may be cut; and a fifth, support it, because—they hate the French. Mr. Young, though not singular, differs somewhat from all of these; he supports the War, in hopes of destroying a combination of Reformers, and procuring Peace for the next fifty years.

To those who would continue the War, in hopes of restoring the ancient Monarchy, which certainly cannot be done, without destroying the present popular principles, I shall observe, that a War against opinions never was successful. Peruse the histories of the Wars against religious Opinions, against Religious Reformers, against the Principles of Freedom in Holland, against the principles of Freedom in America. Were any of these successful, were any of the same kind ever successful? No. In the third campaign, the cause of the Americans seemed to be quite hopeless, twenty times more so than that of France now is, yet it ultimately triumphed. Are not the French the most powerful nation in Europe? Have they not formerly, when less interested in the cause, contended against, and repelled all Europe? Are they not now animated even to madness with hatred against Kings and Nobility? Does not every success of the Combined Armies increase the unanimity, and consequently the strength of France? If enthusiasm in

La

La Vendee so long resisted that power, which so lately threatened the conquest, and since, has successfully withstood all Europe; if in one department it has coped with the competitor of Germany, Italy, Britain, Spain, Holland, &c. what may it not be expected to do in eighty departments? We are led, indeed, to believe, that bribery will produce revolts, and divide the French; but this is the very same expectation which was held out during the American contest, and then much more successfully practised than hitherto has been done in France. The same men are pursuing the same policy. But Hawkesbury, Dundas, Howe, Auckland, and Loughborough, may have no more reason for exultation than they had in 1780. Bribery may, indeed, do much mischief, and it is natural for those, who believe it persuasive, to try its effects on others. But "extravagant Courts, "selfish Ministers, and corrupt, Majorities," are not "intimately interwoven" with French Freedom, and therefore cannot be expected to produce prosperity and happiness in that nation. They do not fight for the glory of a Court, or the folly or ambition of a Minister; every man thinks he fights for himself. Even the Toulonese, while surrendering their town, declared their firm attchment to the Constitution founded in 1789, and the restoration of that Constitution is certainly the furthest stretch from Republicanism to which the French people will consent to go. It therefore follows, that either the allies must relinquish their original views, or animate the French nation, as one man, to maintain the contest against them. And here I will appeal to Mr. Young's favourite "Practice" and "Events," and desire to know, if a War against a people, against so powerful a people as the French, has ever been successful?

To those who wish the restoration of a limited monarchy, of the Constitution founded in 1789, it cannot be necessary to say much to convince them of the hopelessness of their object. They are, indeed, the only

only reasonable class, and it is lamentable therefore that they should have the least prospect of success. It was that Constitution which Mr. Burke reviled, which Mr. Pitt condemned, and which, as I have already shewn, never was sincerely approved by our Government. It is that Constitution which Lords Auckland and Hood attempted to hold up to detestation, when they mentioned the miscreants, who, for *four* years, brought misery on France. But what is more, it was against that Constitution that the German Despots made War, and to acknowledge it, would be to acknowledge that they had failed in their design, that they were defeated. If further proof is wanted, that the Constitution of 1789, and the present Government of France, are equally odious to the continental Despots, look into the prison of La Fayette, who attempted to fix that Constitution, and to save and support the King:—Robespierre or Hebert, if, in their power, could not be treated with more cruelty.—Nay, it is even vain to expect, that the allies design the restoration of the *genuine*, the *ancient French Government!* The States General was a part of the ancient Government, and it was the States General that brought about the Revolution, and framed the Constitution founded in 1789, and accepted by the King in 1791. The Convention at Pilnitz was formed against the States General, after it had given itself another name, indeed, and Lords Auckland and Hood have called them miscreants, who have brought misery on France. It was the States General which began the Revolution, and, according to the allies, began all the present mischief. It cannot, therefore, be the restoration of the *ancient* Constitution which is intended, it can only be a feeble, dependent despotism.

To those who consider the objects of the War, to be the acquisition of territory, it may be observed, that all which we shall probably conquer and retain, will, by no means, compensate for the expences incurred

curred by the continuance of hostilities; and even acquisition of territory, may be of no solid advantage, if we are to believe the speeches and writings of the supporters of Government, who have inferred, from the national prosperity of the last ten years, that the loss of America has been rather a benefit than an injury to Britain. To persons who consider conquests as the object of the present struggle, I will not remark on the infamy of making War for plunder, because, with them, and the tyrants of the continent, such a remark would be treated as a jest.

Those persons who would continue the War, merely because they hate the French, and hope to cut their throats, I consign over to the Crown and Anchor Committee, hoping there is sufficient humanity and religion, in that worthy body, to make them blush at their brutality, and tremble at their breach of the laws of God.

Mr. Young, is for continuing the War to destroy a combination of Reformers, and give us fifty years Peace! This shews the depth of his penetration. I appeal to all the "Experiments," "Practice," and "Events," that he can produce, whether all Wars have not, instead of destroying, created Reformers. As the people feel the weight of burthens, they begin to think of lightening them, and consequently the first thing they turn their thoughts to, is Reform. Was not this particularly the case of the American War? What produced such a combination of Reformers in in 1780, if it was not the expences of that contest, and the mismanagement of the public purse? The same effects will result, in time, from the present War. Every new tax will make Reformers of the class which is fixed on to pay it: And even Mr. Young himself, may again think a Reform desirable, if the necessities of the State should oblige Government to discontinue his salary, and increase the land-tax.

If he could give any proof in support of his assertion, that the present War will produce fifty years Peace, then indeed, however unjust it might be, there would be some policy in continuing it. But what reason have we to expect a Peace of fifty years? Whatever may be the fate of France, does the History of Britain or of Europe justify such an expectation? At the beginning of 1792, Mr. Pitt, assured us, of fifteen years peace; at the beginning of 1793, we found ourselves plunged into a most expensive and alarming War! Is Mr. Young a better prophet than Mr. Pitt? A little more than a year before the commencement of the present War, Mr. Pitt was desirous of involving us in hostilities with Russia, on account of her aggrandizement, and is not the same cause of quarrel likely to exist, in an encreased degree, whenever our dispute with France shall conclude? Nay, as all the powers in Europe are only smothering their old rooted animosities, in order to join in a common cause, will they not quarrel in case of a failure in their present project, by blaming each other with the fault; or in case of success, will they not quarrel about the spoil? If Austria does not gain something considerable, either in France or elsewhere, can it be supposed she will allow Russia and Prussia quietly to retain what they have taken of Poland? In whatever point of view we look at the present attempt upon France, either of failure or success, the result is more likely to leave the seeds of future Wars, than that of any former struggle in Europe. The Empress of Russia is perfectly well aware of this, therefore, she allows the other powers to waste themselves, and reserves her strength till the day of reckoning shall arrive *.

But

* This cunning Princess had succeeded in persuading the late King of Sweden to take an active part in the present crusade, and it is tolerably well known, that her design was to have seized a part of his dominions, when he had so far exhausted himself, as to be incapable

But it would be endless to expose the folly and injustice of the general motives for continuing the present War: It is of much more importance to know, what Administration design by it: And here, if we are to be guided by their declarations, it is but honest to confess total ignorance, for it would seem they do not know themselves. But it is not from the unintelligible hypocritical memorials of Ministers, that the designs of a Government are to be discovered, so much as from the general tenor of their conduct.

The English Court, professedly, began the War in consequence of the decree of fraternity, the attempt to open the Scheldt, and the aggrandizement of France. When satisfaction on all these points was obtained, and France was so far humbled that she would have agreed to any reasonable terms of accommodation, Mr. Fox, in the month of June, moved an Address in favour of Peace, as the avowed causes of War no longer existed. To this Mr. Pitt objected, on the ground, that, although certain points might be the occasion of a War, yet in its conduct and events, there was no saying what objects might arise, which it might be prudent to obtain; that, therefore, though the original grounds of the War no longer existed, yet his Majesty's Ministers thought it would be proper to continue hostilities, in order to procure indemnity for the past, and security for the future. As to these two words *indemnity* and *security*, while it remains undefined, what indemnity or security are desired, as is the case at present, they have no meaning at all, because, they may be made to mean every thing, or any thing, or nothing: They

pable of resistance. This is the reason why Sweden and Denmark, now observe a strict neutrality, and keep a watchful eye over her. The King of Prussia has been drawn into the same snare that was laid for the late King of Sweden, but it is generally believed, that the purse of another power, as well as the assurances of the Empress, was, in the *very first instance*, employed to prevail on him. The consciousness of his own danger from the Empress, now makes him so unwilling to waste his troops against France.

may be interpreted just as the Minister pleases: He may deem a *promise* to pay a certain sum, as was the case in the late dispute with Spain, a sufficient indemnity, and an assurance of faith, though no more to be depended on than the faith of the Empress and King of Prussia, sufficient security: or he may deem nothing less than the complete conquest of France, to be sufficient indemnity and security. To fight for these two objects, unless they are precisely defined, is to fight on the most blind speculation.

Fighting for new objects, that may arise in the conduct and events of a War, is nearly the same thing, as fighting for undefined indemnity and security; and in speaking of the one, the other may always be understood to be implied. They are both equally the Minister's speculations; for how can the people know when the Minister will think he has obtained sufficient indemnity and security, or when he may think it proper to desist from attempting new objects, that may arise in the conduct and events of a War? The present War was professedly begun for certain specified objects, but in its conduct and events, those original objects being obtained, we are next to continue hostilities for undefined indemnity and security, and then we are to establish Monarchy in France!—The conduct and events of the War may yet give rise to new objects, and our wise Ministers may think they have not indemnity and security, unless they not only establish such a government in France as may please them, but also seize some of her territory.—The conduct and events of the War may again give rise to new objects, and indemnity and security may be thought to require, that we should destroy the government we had just given to France, as the King of Prussia did that which he recently guaranteed to Poland, and we may agree to divide the whole French territory among the allies.—Still, in the same manner, new objects arising, may carry us further, and it may be thought neces-

sary

sary, for indemnity and security, to obey the exhortations of some of our divines, and to exterminate the whole French people.—Nay, if success attends us, why should we stop short with France? New objects may arise in the conduct and events of War, which may, according to Mr. Pitt's reasoning, justify its continuance, in hopes of conquering of the whole world!

But, although from their declarations, we cannot precisely ascertain what are the objects of Ministers in the present War, we must conjecture from their conduct, that they are much beyond what it is thought prudent to avow. Why was our intention of giving a monarchical form of government to France concealed till the surrender of Toulon? Had any new circumstances occurred in France, which made it more necessary to interfere in her internal concerns, in August, when Lord Hood took possession of that town, than in February, when the War was begun?—No. But in February the people were not ripe for approving such a project, therefore, it was concealed from them: Nor are they now ripe for approving, what in the conduct and events of this War it may be thought proper to attempt. The ultimate objects must be brought forward by degrees, otherwise they might, perhaps, startle the nation.

Since not only the British Government, but the allies in general, appear, by their inconsistent conduct, to conceal the true objects of the War; since, by taking Valenciennes for the Emperor, Toulon for Louis the XVIIth, and summoning Dunkirk to surrender to the King of Britain *, there appears to be

* The Prince of Saxe Cobourg's proclamations, in April last, in the first of which he engaged to restore the Constitution of 1789, and in the second, recalled that promise, together with General Wurmsur's summons to Landau, in which he called Dumourier's cause (the restoration of the constitution of 1789) a good cause, and his proclamation afterwards in Alsace, in which he ordered those to be shot who wore the national cockade, the emblem of that constitution, should also be recollected.

something of selfishness under all the plausible disinterested professions of giving happiness to France, how are we to solve this mystery? How are we to be guided in searching for the truth? Are we not to judge both of men and governments, rather by their actions, than their professions? If, under pretence of improving an estate, an attorney had taken possession, and by dint of law had wrung it from the legal proprietor; if the same attorney were to offer himself to another man, who knew of this transaction, and to say to him, "your estate is much deranged; your "grounds are neglected, and your tenants idle, dis- "sipated, and wicked; put your estate into my "hands for a short time, I will make it productive "and beautiful, and your tenants industrious, vir- "tuous, and happy:—it will, indeed, cost me many "thousands of pounds,—perhaps half my fortune; "but I am resolved to do all for your benefit, "though I owe you no gratitude, and expect no re- "turn."—If a man who was known to have acted so treacherously in one instance were to attempt to repeat his villainy, would he be believed or trusted?—Would he not, rather, be turned out of the house of him to whom he made the offer?—If, then, it is from the actions of the man that we form our notions of his character and designs, rather than from professions which we know him most scandalously to have belied, why shall we not form our opinion of the character and designs of a government in the same manner?—Have not Prussia and Russia robbed Poland under the pretence of giving her a good Government, and making her happy?—And are they not now holding out the same pretences to France, in hopes of getting possession, and plundering in the same manner, that nation?—Has a single power in Europe remonstrated against the robbery of Poland as it was their duty, and more particularly the duty of Britain, who affected to be alarmed at the cession of Oczakow?—Is not silence, in this case, consent?

How

How then are we to guess at the objects of the present War against France, but by looking at what has been done in Poland, since the same powers are combined against the one, which actually robbed, or tacitly consented to the robbery of the other?—which consented to the dismemberment of Poland, who had neither interfered in the internal concerns of other powers, nor infringed treaties, nor violated the rights of nations, nor aggrandized herself by conquest; whose new Constitution was approved by Mr. Burke and the other gentlemen in this country, who were the most implacable enemies of French principles, and was even sanctioned by its neighbour, the King of Prussia, who afterwards made it the pretext for his robbery.

Such is the prelude to what, in common sense, we must conclude is designed to be acted in France. If bribery can produce treachery and civil commotion, which, seconded by external force,—if, in short, by any means,—for the laws of nations and humanity are laughed at,—the allies can conquer France, they will treat it as they have done Poland, and dismember it in such a manner that it never may again lift its head among nations. They will give it some puppet for a monarch, and, under pretence of awing Jacobinism, will keep up a large standing army for which France will be obliged to pay. This done, the balance of power, for which we have squandered so many millions, will be completely annihilated; and if Russia, Austria, and Prussia can agree about the division of the spoil, they may divide all Europe among themselves *. They may make a second partition of France, as they lately have done of Poland;—they may do juſt as they please all over the continent of Christian Europe, for there will be no power able to oppose them.—And even Britain will

* For a most excellent view of this subject, see the Letters of the Calm Observer.

not

not long be suffered to retain her independence, when the Navies of France, Spain, Holland, Sweden, and Russia, can be turned againſt her;—nay, they will probably make her the most exemplary instance of their vengeance, because she has been the nurse of those principles, against which, in France, they are now making War.

Such, I believe, are the real objects of the present War; and, if the allies are successful, they will, in due time, be unfolded; but whether defeat or triumph follows their arms, the ultimate consequences must be equally pernicious to Britain. For, if their true objects are gained by the conquest of France, Holland and Britain will immediately be at their mercy, and we have seen in Poland what their mercy is: If, on the other hand, the allies fail, we shall be obliged to sit down in disgrace a few years hence; and the large additional burthens may provoke a disappointed and aggrieved people not only to make Reforms, but dangerous innovations. In Lord Cornwallis's late peace, the preserving of Seringapatam was justified on the policy of supporting the balance of power in India; but how much more strongly does the same reasoning apply to the preservation of France? Shall our *gratitude* to Austria and Prussia induce us to ruin ourselves?—A gratitude, which is by no means due to them, as it was not for Holland but for themselves they fought. The wisest policy for Britain, therefore, is to follow the example of the Empress of Russia, and rather strengthen than waste herself, now she has gained all she desired when entering into the contest. To suppose that Prussia, Austria, and Russia design, by this War, to give happiness to France, is so truly ridiculous, that it does not deserve a serious comment;—read the history of the *happiness* which they have bestowed on their own subjects.

The duration of the War, or the events that may take place during its continuance, it is vain to calcu-

late,

late. It was positively asserted of the American War, at its commencement, that it would be finished in one campaign; and in February, 1793, we were taught to expect the same thing of the rupture now existing. Wars of a nature like the present, though even of less importance, have, however, lasted to a period, which might excite ridicule if the same duration were predicted of the struggle now making in France. Wars in former times were continued in that nation forty years.—The war by which Holland was enabled at last to throw off the Spanish yoke lasted sixty years, although Spain was then the most formidable, and Holland the most insignificant country in Europe. Mr. Young by predicting, that the present War will bring us fifty years Peace, and that every year's War will bring ten years Peace in its train, calculates its continuance at five years. On this point, he is much more honest than those who have written on the same side, for they have, and always will, assure us, that another campaign will settle it; and they will hold this language, even after the experience of twenty years, shall have twenty times confuted them. It is impossible to calculate the duration of the War; but, while the allies make the subjection of France their object, it must wear the appearance of a long, bloody, cruel, expensive, ruinous contest. It is not that the Duke of York takes Valenciennes, or Lord Hood, Toulon, or Lord Howe, Brest and Bourdeaux, or the Prince of Saxe Cobourg, Rouen, Lyons, and Paris: The greatest part of France, may be conquered by treachery and force; but will it long remain so? Can all the powers in Europe keep a standing army, (liable to imbibe the principles of liberty,) sufficient to awe France into perpetual subjection? Will not the inhuman conduct of Prussians and Austrians, which has already shewn itself in Alsace and Lorraine, provoke frequent and formidable insurrections? The example of this country shews, that where the

principles of liberty are sown, force will rather nourish than destroy them, and as the principles of Liberty are firmly implanted in the breasts of the French people, they never can be rooted out. Temporary calamity may disgust them at their Governors, but they never have been, nor never will be disgusted at their principles. France may, indeed, be apparently overcome, and Peace established; but a people, filled with high notions of Freedom, never will long submit to Despotic sway: Frequent Wars will occur, until at last, the Conquerors will be exhausted, and Liberty will triumph. Mr. Young infers, because the English Republican Spirit in the last century ended in Despotism, that therefore, the Republican Spirit in France will end in Despotism also:—Despotism, may possibly, succeed the present Republic, and reign for a while as it did in England; but did not the same principles which brought Charles the First to the block, also expel James the IId. and bring about the Revolution of 1688? And will not the doctrines now sown in France, ultimately settle some form of Government, Monarchical or Republican, founded on the principles of Liberty? But it is extremely improbable, that a great and powerful nation of Enthusiasts will be overcome, even by treachery and force. Their strength must not be calculated by a narrow Court Policy; nor, because Hessians, Hanoverians, and Sardinians, will not fight without money, in what is deemed a common cause, muſt it be concluded, that Frenchmen are equally mercenary: There is a National Treasury, more powerful than all the tax offices in Britain, in the breasts of Frenchmen:—a love of Liberty. The American paper was much lower than ever that of France has been, yet America triumphed; and though their Government has excited our contempt and horror, yet it cannot be denied that the French troops have lately displayed energy, enterprize, and bravery, scarcely equalled, certainly never surpassed

in

in the world. Whatever fond hopes may be formed of the next campaign, I fear they will prove illusive, for our future success is not to be calculated by the events of last summer. Another Dumourier may not be found to destroy the principal army, and leave the northern frontier unprotected: On the contrary, we have seen the ruinous effects of his treachery repaired, and the tide again turned against us: Nor will his treatment encourage further treachery, or the treatment of the Toulonese, encourage Royalism. It may even be seen by the treatment the Ex-Princes of France receive, that the Allies do not design to restore them to their former fortunes*, but that they intend something both against them, and the Nation at large, which, it is feared, those noblemen will not agree to, and therefore, instead of being held up as conspicuous leaders in what is professed to be principally their own cause, they are kept in the back ground and treated with coldness.

The subjugation and partition of France, together with the establishment of an insignificant Despotism, being therefore, the evident objects † of the continental Triumvirate, it may be useful to enquire whether Great-Britain will assist them to the full extent of their views, how she can stop short of them, and make Peace; whether, in any stage of the War our

* While the Allies were in possession of Toulon, the inhabitants of that City requested that Monsieur might be brought there and declared Regent; which according to the old Government he ought to be: this both the English and Spaniards refused to do!

† It has been said, that the cession of the strong holds on the northern frontier of France, would satisfy the Allies, and I have little doubt, that they really would do so, for the present. It would indeed, be a small cession of territory, but, it would in fact, be a cession of much more danger to this country, than, not only the cession of Oczakow, but of all Turkey in Europe. If the Allies possessed that bulwark, they might not only confine the French, while they plundered Holland, Denmark and Sweden, as they have done Poland, but the whole of France would be laid open to their marauding incursions.

Government will be disposed, of itself, to put a period to hostilities; whether, it will not be obliged to do so by the remonstrances of the people; in what manner it can make Peace, and what may be the consequences of being compelled to make it by the public.

The first of these enquiries need be but short; it is but to read the Treaty with the King of Sardinia, wherein, it is agreed, to pay him 200,000l. per annum, during the *whole course of the War*, and the other Treaties with Russia and Prussia, Austria, &c. through which we guarantee the dominions of all the belligerent powers against the arms of France. By these Treaties, we perceive, that as long as the French possess a single inch of ground belonging to the confederated Powers, or, as long as any of the Allies think proper to carry on the War, we are bound by Treaty to carry it on also, and without a breach of faith, cannot stop short, and desert their cause. If to these Treaties, we add the conduct of our Ambassadors in Denmark, Sweden, Tuscany, and Genoa, we may very reasonably conclude, that the British Cabinet is not only embarked to the full extent of the views of the Princes on the Continent, but is one of the most zealous, and even furious of the allies; for our Government seems eager to surpass in violence all that has been done by other powers. Peace, therefore, originating in the British Cabinet, must be at a very great distance.

The next question is, will the people patiently submit to a long continuance of the distresses which are always brought on by War, and invariably increased by its protraction? Will they quietly see their blood shed, and their enormous debts doubled, in a vain attempt to give a King to France, and to aggrandize, by the plunder of her territories, the ambitious Despots of the continent? The History of the American War, shews, that national distress will certainly open the eyes of the people to the folly of Government; and

and the growing dissatisfaction at the present War, shews, that a campaign or two more, will make it as unpopular as ever that with America was. It will daily become more manifest that we can derive no benefit equal to the risk we run, and the actual loss we must sustain by the continuance of hostilities. I therefore think the people will, at some period, not very distant, perhaps, put an end to this War, as they did to that with America, by petitions and addresses. If then, in one, two, or three years the people *demand* a peace, *it must be granted.* But how is it to be made? —By doing that which Government has so much reprobated, by negociating with, and acknowledging the French Republic. It has indeed, been said, that Britain may withdraw her forces, and by some underhand means, procure a secession of hostilities, which, until a regular Government is settled, will be equal to a formal Peace: But when the French find the mass of the English people resolved on a termination of hostilities, will they not insist upon an avowed negociation with, and an acknowledgment of the Republic? When they find the Court of St. James's unable longer to carry on the War, will not they insist upon their own terms? And will not a humiliating compliance, as was the case with America, be the consequence? It is with this War, as it is with Parliamentary Reform: At present, Peace and Reform, might be made with the greatest advantage, in the same manner as a Peace with America, long after the commencement of that unfortunate contest, might have been made on beneficial terms. But obstinacy has of late been the characteristic of our Government. After the first campaign with America she might have been reconciled to us; after the first campaign with France, we have it in our power to obtain ample reparation for all which gave us offence. It is ridiculous to talk of the indecency of negociating with the present rulers of that country when we recollect, that in 1777 we negociated with, and made

dear

dear Allies, of the wild savages in America, and instigated them to make War upon the United States, which they did in the most horrible manner! it is ridiculous to talk of our dignity being insulted by negociating with the rulers of France, when the ignominious treatment of the Representative of our King, by the Ottoman Porte, is recollected *: it is ridiculous to say, we can have no security for the continuance of Peace, as the rulers of France may daily be supplanted, for, no Government in Europe observes Peace longer than it is its interest to do so, and without expatiating on the late want of faith in Russia, Prussia, &c. with regard to Poland, I will venture to affirm, what is certainly true, that every party which has governed France, during the last four years, and every party likely to succeed to the Government, has been, and will be desirous, and even proud of keeping Peace with Britain. But of late, our Court has commonly persisted to the last extremity; till the popular tide has forced it to unconditional submission. And, I fear, the present contest will be prosecuted, till Peace must be made on *any* terms, and then Mr. Burke may do what he ridiculed in Lord North's Administration, towards the conclusion of the American War, and say to the French, "Now do have a King †!"

The evident determination of the Government to prosecute the War, is not so dejecting a circumstance,

* Before our Ambassador is introduced to the Grand Seignor, he is obliged to eat some food, which is given him in the Palace, and to put on a cloak, worth about 30l. presented to him at the same time. When he comes into the sublime Presence, he is held by the arms by two officers, who will not permit him to bow of his own accord, but who, laying their hands on his head, *force* him to bow. They then say to their Sovereign, "Here is a poor man. "We found him hungry, and we fed him; we found him naked, "and we clothed him."—What becomes of the British Dignity on this occasion?

† This, indeed, has already been said in Mr. Pitt's late extraordinary Manifesto.

as the too general encouragement given, not only to panegyrics on the corruptions and defects of our Constitution, but to the most false accusations, and the most shameful calumny against those who desire the restoration of tranquillity. To petition for Peace, is deemed sedition; to contend in Parliament for Peace, is deemed treason, for what else can we conclude, from the abuse thrown on the Glasgow petition, and the insinuations of Mr. Powis *, respecting Mr. Fox. The many wicked aspersions thrown on the character and conduct of the latter of those gentlemen, may, however, be justly construed as eulogiums on his public virtue; for, if ever there was a man, who conscious of acting with rectitude, maintained the true interests of his country with firmness, consistency, and moderation, against all that could deject and terrify, he is the man: If ever private interest and public fame; if ever the sweets of social life, and the prospects of state elevation were sacrificed to the national welfare, and to the liberties and happiness of mankind, they were sacrificed by Mr. Fox last winter. He stood forward, almost alone, and with gigantic power arrested the Government in its wanton intoxicated career. Sedition and insurrection had been declared to exist, the Attorney-General's table was said to be loaded with hundreds of indictments, and thousands were recorded as disaffected persons, upon the authority of anonymous letters †, and the veracity of common informers. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus

* This gentleman, in the House of Commons, after bestowing many eulogiums on Mr. Fox, said, though he was perfectly convinced of the Right Hon. Gentleman's integrity, yet his conduct in that House, was exactly such as an advocate of the French Convention would pursue. This, out of doors, was asserted to be a downright fact; and Mr. F. was even represented in the print shops, as the advocate of the French, with a brief and a fee in his hand.

† This was done by Mr. Reeves. See Mr. Law's letter on his secession from the Crown and Anchor Committee.

Act

Act was announced in the House of Commons, and had it taken place, it is probable that every man who presumed to enquire into the propriety of the measures of Government, who praised Liberty in England, or who dared look cheerful when events occurred favourable to it in other countries, would have been dragged to a dungeon. But Mr. Fox stood forward with truth and energy. The Government was awed:—It paused:—and, finding the proofs of insurrection and sedition vague and trifling, it refrained from measures, which the delusion of the people might then, indeed, have applauded, but which their sober reason, at an after period, must have condemned and execrated. He undauntedly struggled to avert the calamities of War; he did not succeed: But he succeeded in what was of much more immediate importance perhaps, in shielding the remaining Liberties of the English people.

His enemies have alledged motives for his conduct, not only base, but incredible. The Tory Jacobins, have accused him of being the hired advocate of France; the Revolutionary Jacobins, with being stimulated only by a selfish ambition*; and the moderate

* "I hope there are none among you, corrupted with the doctrine taught by wicked men for the worst purposes, and received by the malignant credulity of envy and ignorance, which is, that the men who act upon the public stage are all alike; all equally corrupt; all influenced by no other views than the sordid lucre of salary and pension. The age unquestionably produces, (whether in a greater or less number than former times, I know not) daring profligates, and insidious hypocrites. What then?—Am I not to avail myself of whatever good is to be found in the world because of the mixture of evil that will always be in it? I have been deceived, say they, by *Titus* and *Mævæus*; I have been the dupe of this pretender or that mountebank; and I can trust appearances no longer. A conscientious person would rather doubt his own judgment than condemn his species. He would say, I have trusted to profession when I ought to have attended to conduct. He that accuses all mankind of Corruption ought to remember that he is sure to convict only one. That this ill-natured doctrine should be preached by the Missionaries of a Court I do not wonder. It answers

moderate, honest alarmists, though agreeing with neither of these, were not inclined to attribute virtuous motives to a man, who not only differed from them in political sentiment, but whose character they found equally bespattered by the extremes of both parties.

The accusation of the Tory Jacobins, is evidently so unfounded, that it is unnecessary to waste time in refuting it. The ruling Powers of France have changed so often that such a thing, had it existed, must long ago have been discovered. Nay, one of the charges against the Brissot party, made by the party of the Mountain, is, that they too precipitately involved France in a War with Britain; and even the supporters of the War at home, affirm it was unprovoked on our part, and that the French were anxious to commence it. Brissot's, was the ruling party last winter, and if it was true, that they were eager for hostilities, is it probable, they would bribe any man to prevent them? Nor could the de-

answers their purpose. But that it should be heard among those who pretend to be strong assertors of Liberty, is not only surprising but hardly natural. This moral levelling is a *servile principle*. It leads to practical passive obedience far better than all the doctrines which the pliant accommodation of theology to power has ever produced. It cuts up by the roots not only all idea of forcible resistance, but even of civil opposition. It disposes men to an abject submission. For if all men who act in a public situation are equally selfish, corrupt, and venal, what reason can be given for desiring any sort of change? The active men in the State are true samples of the mass. If they are universally depraved, the Commonwealth itself is not sound. We may amuse ourselves with talking as much as we please of the virtue of middle or humble life; that is, we may place our confidence in the virtue of those who have never been tried. But if the persons who are continually emerging out of that sphere, be no better than those whom birth has placed above it, what hopes are there in the remainder of the body, which is to furnish the perpetual succession of the State?"

Burke, vol. ii. page 150, 1, and 2.

traction of the ruling men * in the Convention, at the moment the rupture was made, be interpreted as proof that Mr. Fox was connected with them. But last winter passion had so blinded the most alarmed of the Alarmists, that palpably unfounded assertions, if agreeing with their wishes, received the most implicit credit: For, "there are seasons of believing as well as disbelieving: And believing was "then so much in season, that improbabilities, or inconsistencies, were little considered. Nor was it "safe so much as to make reflections on them. That "was called, the *blasting of the plot*, and disparaging "the King's evidence †."

The conduct of many parliamentary men gives some colour of truth to the charge of the Revolutionary Jacobins. It is an incontrovertible fact, that opposition to Government has too often arisen only in the hope of gratifying a personal ambition. It is, however, also a fact, still more incontrovertible, and a fair examination of circumstances will clearly shew, that Mr. Fox, last winter, could not be actuated by any motives of that nature; but, that on the contrary, his conduct was the very last which would have been pursued, either by an avaricious, or by an ambitious man: For, if his prime object had been a place, or a pension, there never was a more favourable opportunity for gaining it. To oppose Government was then generally detestable, almost dangerous: to desert principles and parties, and coalesce with Administration, was deemed by the country the height of public virtue. It was honourable in the extreme for Whigs and Tories to embrace and co-operate: Consistency of conduct became a crime, and apostacy

* See Kersaint's Report, wherein Mr. Fox, is much more calumniated, than Mr. Pitt.

† See Bishop Burnet's Account of the Alarmists at the time of the pretended Polish Plot, in his History of his own Times. Vol. I. p. 448.

the

the purest patriotism. The people considered it Mr. Fox's duty to join the Court party; his acceptance of an official situation, and thereby gratifying avarice, and even ambition, would have received the warm applause and gratitude of his countrymen, as a sacrifice of party views and personal antipathies, to what they believed the national welfare.

Such were the temptations to induce Mr. Fox to follow his own private interest, and indulge his ambition. If, on the other hand, we view the reasons he had to *deter* him from supporting Peace and Reform, we shall find them not only inconsistent with avarice and ambition; not only that he was to forego all hopes of sharing the honours and emoluments of office; not only that he was to incur the resentment and odium of the nation, and be branded as the leader of sedition by the one side, and accused of pusilanimity and insincerity by those among whom he was classed on the other, but his dearest friends, and most valuable connections were to desert and revile him with a degree of malignity and injustice which his oldest enemies never could arrive at. Of about two hundred co-adjutors in the House of Commons, scarce fifty adhered to him;—of about one hundred in the House of Peers, there remained not more than six!—Instead of being courted and adored, to be shunned and calumniated, by an host of men of the greatest fortunes and talents in the kingdom, was surely no encouragement either to avarice or ambition. To have all classes, to have Tories and Whigs, to have those who are called Jacobins, and those who were called Friends, join in the outcry against him; to lose both popularity and court favour, and even the enjoyments of private society; to encounter at once the frowns of the throne, and the indignation of the people, required courage, independence and abilities rarely to be met with. The undaunted, disinterested exertions of Mr. Fox last winter, in favour of Freedom, expiate all his former errors. Indeed, a recollection

of circumstances gives reason to hope he never will again be betrayed into such errors as those which some years ago rendered him most unpopular. For if we may believe report, the most odious of those measures were prompted and executed by persons who have since betrayed and deserted him. The coalition in 1784 was projected by a noble deserter, now at the head of the law department, and the negociation was carried on, and the measure enforced by him and his train of alarmists. The East-India bill, which begot the *charter alarmists*, and at once pushed Mr. Fox from power and popularity, was the production of Mr. Burke, whose measures Mr. Fox found it always more easy to support in public, than oppose in private. To the dogmatical opinions of that gentleman, therefore, the mistakes of Mr. Fox are greatly, if not wholly to be attributed, and so well aware is Mr. Pitt, of Mr. Burke's unruly temper, that it is not probable he ever will consent to his admisson into the cabinet. If to the coalition and the India Bill, is added, the support Mr. Fox gave to certain great personages, who have also deserted him, then, all that has made him unpopular may be summed up. It is his personal attachments that have injured his public character, and we now find those for whom he has made so important a sacrifice, eagerly aggravating the opprobrium which originated in a respect for their opinions, and a zeal for their service. But their conduct may prove fortunate for his reputation. Unincumbered by their baneful influence, and following the dictates of his own reason, his integrity and wisdom must ultimately be acknowledged; and though he may ever remain unrewarded with either place or popularity, the purity of his views, and the prudence of his councils, may yet save this infatuated country.

It would be endless to enumerate the libels that have been, and daily are published against him. Mr. Young's book contains one of the most fallacious and wicked; and it may serve as an epitome of the others.

In

In the debate on Parliamentary Reform, on the 7th of May last, Mr. Fox said, " *If* the King and the " House of Lords were unnecessary and useless " branches of the Constitution, let them be dismissed " and abolished; for the people were not made " for them, but they for the people*. If, on the " contrary, the King and the House of Lords were " felt and believed by the people, *as he was con-* " *fident they were*, to be not only useful, but *essential* " *parts* of the Constitution, a House of Commons, " freely chosen by, and speaking the sentiments of " the people, would cherish and protect both within " the bounds which the Constitution had assigned " them†." Mr. Young artfully drops the hypothesis, and throughout several pages, accuses Mr. Fox with recommending the dismissal of the King, and abolition of the House of Lords!—He omits the context where Mr. Fox says, he is confident the people *feel* and *believe* the King and the House of Lords to be *useful* and *essential* parts of the Constitution, and that a House of Commons, freely chosen, and speaking the sentiments of the people, would *cherish and protect them*. Could there be a greater tribute of respect, and approbation of those two branches of the Constitution than was paid by Mr. Fox, in declaring the people love and will protect them?—Could there be a more gross misrepresentation and flagitious calumny than the assertion of Mr. Young?

Despising the thousands of atrocious libels, and regardless of his own interest, still we see Mr. Fox unsubdued by menace or allurement persevering with

* Mr. Young, in a note on this passage, says, the Nobility and the King made the people, and that therefore the people were made for them! Upon his own mode of arguing it may, however, be proved, that the King was made for the people; for did not the people make the Brunswick the Royal Family of this country? Mr. Young, I suppose, would have the English people made *for* the King, as the Hessians are made for the Prince of Hesse: to be sold.

† See Debrett's Debates.

intrepidity

intrepidity and moderation in support of the Peace, Liberties, and Happiness of his country. But whatever consolation may be found in his conduct, the general view of public affairs is full of dejection and alarm. On the continent, the laws and rights of nations are trampled on with impunity, without remonstrance, and an extensive dangerous system of robbery is established. The balance of power is lost,—almost forgotten; and whether a Republic is attempted in France, or a limited Monarchy, like our own, in Poland, the fact of desiring Liberty, *in any degree*, is so offensive to the Combination of Despots, that they instantly take arms against it;—they deem a wish for Freedom sufficient to justify all sorts of massacre, devastation, and plunder. There appears to be no medium; no hope of compromise can at present be entertained. An universal War is kindled, which threatens the complete annihilation of Liberty on the one side, or the total destruction of all established Governments on the other; for such appear to be the views of the two parties, accordingly as the scale of success inclines in their favour. A permanent and equitable Peace, therefore, can only be expected, after a long, equal contest, shall have destroyed the means of further warfare; after both parties, in point of conquest, shall find themselves just where they began, but mutually weakened by bloodshed and expence; after they shall have exhausted themselves into tranquillity.

At home the prospect is not less full of dejection and alarm than on the continent. In Ireland, a most extraordinary bill has passed to prevent the people from expressing their wishes:—In Scotland, the most *unprecedented* punishments have been inflicted on those who have advised a peaceable and constitutional Reform of Parliament. These new and alarming experiments have been successfully made in the extremities of the Empire, and it would appear that force is preparing in order to insure their reception

in

in the interior. Barracks are erecting in every part of England, where a standing army is to be kept, insulated from the people; and if that is found insufficient for the purposes of Government, foreign Mercenaries may, by treaty, be landed * to overawe and secure submission. Our Constitution so much boasted for its bleſſings, and its excellence, is libelled with impunity, as corrupt and ugly, by those who support the Government, and the libellers are rewarded with places and pensions for saying, that "extravagant Courts, selfish Ministers, and corrupt "Majorities, are intimately interwoven with the "practical freedom of Britain," and *are good*, while those who affirm they do exist and *are bad*, are punished with the pillory, not avowedly, for saying they are bad, but for saying they do exist. To call the Constitution *pure* † has become a crime;—to call it *corrupt* recommends to ministerial favour. Mr. Young says "its spirit and principles admit of torturing at "pleasure" (p. 199) and I fear it is at present just what the Government chooses to make it,—just what the people will bear. The Freedom of the Press is destroyed by associators ‡ for its defence; the sacredness of the pulpit is brutally attacked by pretended combatants for religion §; all confidence in public

* The 7th article of the late Hessian Treaty sets forth, that "If it should happen, they" (the Landgrave's Troops) shall be "employed in Great Britain or Ireland, as soon as the notification, in such case, shall be made to the Serene Landgrave, "they ſhall be put on the same footing, in every respect, as the "national British Troops."—This Pamphlet had scarcely appeared before eight thousand Hessians were landed *without the knowledge* of Parliament.

† See Mr. Young's remarks on the petition of the Friends of the People.

‡ Mr. Reeves, while he charges publicans to beware of taking in what he calls seditious newspapers, &c. says, he wishes to support the *true* Liberty of the Press!

§ See the account of the treatment of the Rev. V. Knox, by the Militia Officers who have taken up arms againſt the *Atheiſts* of France.

men

men has received a mortal blow by those who have called most loudly for confidence *, and the professed champions of the Constitution are the most busy in "knocking it down †." Petitions are treated with contempt, petitioners stigmatized as traitors, and the vague charge of sedition, has put a seal on mens lips. We are to be brought back to darkness and barbarism ‡ as the only state in which we can be happy, for knowledge in the poor, is found dangerous to the State, and ignorance and intolerance its best security. There are but two measures necessary to accomplish all this: First, to establish a standing force sufficient to intimidate or punish the refractory;—Secondly, to suppress the Freedom of Speech, and of the Press.

But all exhortations in favour of Freedom, are so generally considered, at present, as wild and delusive theories, that it may not be improper to call in the assistance of Mr. Young's "Experiment," "Practice," and "Events," to shew what have been the consequences of times similar to the present. I shall leave the reader to judge by the following extracts from the second volume of Rapin's History of England, how far the conclusion of the reign of Charles the IId. resembled the present time. But I beg the

* By the apostate in the cause of Parliamentary Reform.—Mr. Pitt.

† A more deadly blow never was given to the Constitution than it has recently received by Government's calling for Subscriptions from the people for public purposes, without the knowledge of Parliament; than by landing foreign troops without the knowledge of Parliament; and, than by the doctrine advanced by the Lord Advocate of Scotland, and Mr. Secretary Dundas, that the English Law should be squared according to that of Scotland.

‡ Mr. Young not only recommends the abolition of Sunday Schools, and the Liberty of the Press, but says, the poor should not be taught to read, left they should read such dangerous books as Mr. Paine's!—I wonder he did not also recommend the cutting out of men's tongues, lest they should speak seditious words. Without tongues they would be equally, perhaps more serviceable as slaves, as hewers of wood and drawers of water.

comparison

comparison may be understood as relating to the nation at large, and not as applying to his Majesty. With some changes of words, but none of meaning, I think, the national temper in 1684, and in 1793, will be found to be strongly alike.

" From this time, the King, during the rest of his life, governed not only without a Parliament, but with an absolute power. When he saw himself out of the reach of the Parliament, he entirely threw away the mask of dissimulation, and shewed, that the Popish Plot, the prosecution whereof he had lately recommended so earnestly to the Parliament, appeared to him but a mere chimera, or at least, he did not think it near so dangerous as he would have had it believed. It is necessary to unfold the causes of so surprising a Revolution. By the artifices of the Court, and the natural inclination of many Englishmen, the kingdom was divided into Whigs and Tories. This division was so carefully fomented by the Court, and the Popish party, that at last it became very great. To render the two parties irreconcileable, it was insinuated to the Episcopalians, of whom the majority were Tories, that both Church and Monarchy were in danger, and that the scene of *forty-one* * was going to be revived. That the Presbyterians †, under colour of providing for the preservation of Liberty, really intended the destruction of the Church, and the introduction of Presbyterianism ‡, in order to which, they were pursuing the same course they had taken in 1640, and the following years, by undermining the foundations of Monarchy, for the more easy subversion of the Church. These insinuations had the greater effect, as what had once happened, and where-

* " *The scene of forty-one*," that is, the Commonwealth, terrified the nation then, in the same manner as the scene of France now does.

† For Presbyterians may now always be understood Reformers.

‡ And introduction of Republicanism.

of, the memory was still fresh, might happen again. The Episcopalians, terrified with the prospect of falling into the same state, from which they had been miraculously delivered, considered the introduction of Popery *, with which they were alarmed, as a distant and uncertain evil, and the establishment of Presbyterianism †, as certain and present. It is even very probable, that many whose passions were violent, looked upon Popery as the less evil. In this belief, they threw themselves, as it were, desperately into the Court Party" (p. 723.)

" Addresses became so much in vogue, that the smallest Corporations feared the resentment of the Court, if they neglected to address. The King received them all very graciously, and distinguished those who brought them with particular marks of his favour. The Lord Mayor, Recorder, and some others of the City of London, waiting on him at Windsor, with one of a very contrary nature, were denied admittance, and ordered to attend the Council, at Hampton-Court, where they received a reprimand from the Lord Chancellor. It was pretended that these loyal addresses, as they were called, expressed the sentiments of the people in general, though they came but from one of the parties. But what may make it presumed that the King did not much depend upon the people, notwithstanding these numerous Addresses, which weekly filled the Gazettes, is, that he never after dared to call a Parliament ‡. If these addresses had expressed the general sense of the people, what could have hindered the King from calling a Parliament, which, to judge by these Addresses, must have been devoted to him."

* For Popery may always be understood absolute power.

† Republicanism.

‡ For calling a Parliament, it may here be understood, calling a *reformed* Parliament.

" The

" The King was not satisfied with discouraging those who would have presented disagreeable Addresses to him, but also silenced and imprisoned the news-writers, who were not of his party, while others had liberty to publish daily invectives against the Whigs and the late Parliament" (p. 724.)

" Every man, who was not of the Court Party, and a furious Tory, was called a Presbyterian †. The Clergy, particularly distinguished themselves, by shewing their attachment to the principles and maxims of the Court. The pulpits resounded with the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance. The Clergy, seemed to make it their business to surrender to the King, all the Liberties and Privileges of the subject. According to the principles they preached, no Eastern Monarch was more absolute than the King of England. This doctrine was supported in the Courts of Justice, by all the Judges and Lawyers, to the utmost of their power. All this was followed with numberless Petitions and Addresses. Any man's thinking of associating the subjects against the King, was sufficient, according to the current principles, to charge the whole Whig Party as guilty of the greatest crime imaginable. Thus, the violent Tories, who then prevailed in the Corporations, were not satisfied with persecuting the Presbyterians, but also made the King an arbitrary and absolute Monarch, as if there had been no other expedient to save the Church of England from the attempts of the Presbyterians."

" Though supported by the Court and the Magistrates, the Tory Party had the advantage, the Whigs were not discouraged, in expectation of causing some turn, by informing the people in pamphlets of their danger. This did but exasperate the patrons of passive obedience. They took occasion from thence to carry the doctrine so high, *that when in the*

† A Republican.

reign of James the IId. restrictions became necessary, they knew not how to make them, and many even persisted in supporting this doctrine, rather than own they had been in the wrong, to carry it to such a height (p. 725.) In short, a kind of infatuation seized the kingdom, and one party, instead of coming to a temper, violently embraced whatever was most contrary to the other" (p. 726.)

The King having thus far succeeded, thought another alarm necessary, in order to terrify the people into a more full compliance with his design, and accordingly, the Rye-House Plot was set on foot, by which, " the whole kingdom being struck with terror, the King believed he ought to improve it to the establishment of his absolute power, so as to have nothing to fear from any future opposition. This was by depriving all the Corporations, and consequently all his subject, of their privileges. It was not proper to use absolute power, but to proceed in a manner more politic and more dangerous to the people, by engaging them to make a voluntary surrender * of their charters, in order to receive such new ones as the King should please to grant. For this purpose, Courtiers and Emissaries were sent to the more considerable Corporations to inspire them with terror, and intimate to them, that scarce one could escape, should the King exercise strict justice. This chiefly concerned the Whigs and Non-Conformists, for the Tories were generally very readily blinded to obey the pleasure of the Court. Jeffries, particularly distinguished himself in his northern circuit, at the summer assizes. He forgot nothing capable of terrifying the people, assuring them, that a surrender of their charters was the only way to avert the mischiefs which hung over their heads. Other Judges and Emissaries did the same, and at last,

* Mr. Young advises the people of England, to surrender almost every Liberty they possess.

the

the larger Corporations being thus gained, the lesser necessarily followed. So a sudden and great change was seen in England, namely, the English nation, without Rights or Privileges, but such as the King would vouchsafe to grant her; and what is more strange, the English themselves surrendered to Charles the IId. those very Rights and Privileges, which they had defended with so much passion, or rather fury, against the attempts of Charles the First."

" To make the people in some measure fully sensible of their new slavery, the King affected to muster his forces, which, from one regiment of foot, and one troop of horse guards, (raised by himself, with the murmurs of many of his subjects) were encreased to four thousand, completely trained and effective men. It might then be seen, that the Members of Parliament *, who opposed the raising, or at least the establishment of these guards, were not altogether in the wrong. But the zeal of the Tory Party was now arrived to such a height, that they looked on every thing which contributed to render the King absolute, as a sure means to ruin the Whigs, and consequently as a triumph for them. They preposterously imagined that the Court only aimed at the destruction of that odious Party, and was solely labouring for the Tories" (p. 734.)

Such were the effects of the pretended plots, and the unfounded alarms in the reign of Charles the IId. They so successfully induced the people to surrender their Liberties, that James the IId. was encouraged afterwards to attempt the establishment of Despotism. A Revolution then became absolutely necessary; and, thanks to the pusilanimity of that Prince, it was made without bloodshed.

* Here let Mr. M. A. Taylor's opposition to the establishment of Barracks be remembered.

The

The base insidious tools of Corruption are endeavouring to delude the nation into the same predicament in which it was in 1684. They have sought for that which man most values, and they find it to be "PROPERTY." In order, therefore, to deter him from overthrowing the pernicious system in which they fatten, they cry, "Reform will rob you "of your Property!"—But these are the delusive, treacherous cries of the hyæna, and will betray ultimately into certain ruin. A Parliamentary Reform has been approved, at various periods, by a majority of men, both in Parliament and out of it, and even those who never supported the measure, have, notwithstanding, indirectly condemned the present construction of the House of Commons, or approved the principles on which a Reform is demanded *. When times of affliction and uneasiness occur, therefore, our defective Representation will be deemed, and too justly, I fear, the cause of them. A Reform will then be made, not with caution, and a dread of going too far, as would be the case at present, but with indignation and vengeance. Moderate men will not be listened to. The most wild theorists will be entrusted with the work, and instead of a peace-

* The King, in his speeches to Parliament, after the American War, when Reform was so much agitated, expressed his desire to support the different branches of the Constitution, in their *due balance*:—to support the *true spirit* of the Constitution, and to use his authority for the good of the people, for which purpose alone it was given to him. These sentiments, according to Mr. Young, are dangerous to the Government. And even Mr. Burke, about the period alluded to, said, the King had gone so far as to recommend Reform from the Throne.

In addition to the above, Mr. Burke has called our Representation the "slough of slavery:" Mr. Powis, in 1784, boasted of assembling a little senate of independant Members round him, by which he implied, the majority were not independant. And the Dukes of Portland and Devonshire, with many more Peers, signed a protest in 1777, against an increase of the civil list, because it was reported, the money was employed in *corrupting* Parliament.

ful,

ful, salutary Reform, we shall, probably, be involved in all the calamities which at present torture France.

Mr. Burke, not when he gloried in the establishment of a *Republic* in America, but long after he began to reprobate the establishment of a *limited Monarchy* in France, said *, " Great discontents fre-
" quently arise in the best constituted Governments,
" from causes which no human wisdom can foresee,
" and no human power can prevent. They occur at
" uncertain periods, but at periods, which are not
" commonly far asunder. Governments of all kinds
" are administered only by men; and great mis-
" takes, tending to inflame these discontents, may
" concur. The indecision of those who happen to
" rule at the critical time, their supine neglect, or
" their precipitate and ill-judged attention, may ag-
" gravate the public misfortunes. In such a state
" of things, the principles now only sown, will shoot
" out, and vegetate in full luxuriance. In such cir-
" cumstances, the minds of the people become sore
" and ulcerated. They are put out of humour with
" all public men, and all public parties; they are
" fatigued with their dissentions; they are irritated
" at their coalitions; they are made easily to believe
" (what much pains are taken to make them believe)
" that all Oppositions are factious, and all Courtiers
" base and servile. From their disgust at men, they
" are soon led to quarrel with their frame of Go-
" vernment, which they presume gives nourishment
" to the vices, real or supposed, of those who ad-
" minister in it. Mistaking malignity for sagacity,
" they are soon led to cast off all hope from a good
" administration of affairs, and come to think, that
" all Reformation depends, not on a change of actors,
" but upon an alteration in the machinery."

Before the minds of men are sore and ulcerated, and the principles now sown, shoot out into full lux-

* See his appeal from the old to the new Whigs.

uriance,

urjance, let us, therefore, give each part its proper force, and amend and renovate the machinery of the State, while there is no danger that, in doing so, it will tumble to pieces. War is the parent of Discontent, and Discontent is the nurse of Revolution. A continuance of hostilities will produce the times which Mr. Burke describes, and then, as in France, it will be too late to Reform. Instead, therefore, of wasting our blood and treasure to make a King of France, and to give felicity to that nation, let us seize this favourable opportunity to repair and invigorate our own Constitution; for the only means of promoting and insuring prosperity and happiness to Britain are a speedy Peace, and an effectual Parliamentary Reform,

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

AS it is asserted in the preceding pages, that several of the principal Members of Administration, as well as the chief abettors of the present War, have formerly done the very same things for which persons are now transported; without making a detailed comparison between the charges against Mr. Muir and Mr. Pitt's calling, from the Thatched House Tavern in 1782, for the sense of the people in order to set it up in opposition to the sense of Parliament, or of Mr. Windham's haranguing the poor manufacturers at Norwich, during the American War, for the purpose of making them exert themselves in opposition to the will of the Legislature, I shall simply make a parody between the writings of Mr. Burke, the Duke of Richmond, &c. during the American War, to shew that they are not only equally violent, but almost the very words for which Mr. Palmer now suffers, and that therefore, had the English law been squared by that of Scotland twenty years ago, those Gentlemen would most probably not now have been in Britain to have recommended such an unconstitutional and odious proceeding.

Palmer's Hand-Bill.

Dundee Berean Meeting-House, July, 1793.

Friends and Fellow Citizens,

You who by your loyal and steady conduct in these days of adversity, have shewn that you are worthy of, at least, some small portion of Liberty, unto you we address our language and tell our fears.

In spite of the virulent scandal, or malicious efforts of the people's enemies, we will tell you whole truths, they are of a kind to alarm and arouse you out

There never, Gentlemen, was a period in which the stedfastness of some men has been put to so sore a trial. It is not very difficult for well-informed minds to abandon their interest; but the separation of fame and virtue is an harsh divorce. *Liberty is in danger of being made unpopular to Englishmen.* Contending for an imaginary power, we begin to acquire the spirit of domination, and to lose the

out of your lethargy. That portion of Liberty you once enjoyed is faſt ſetting, we fear, in the darkneſs of deſpotiſm and tyranny! Too ſoon, perhaps, you whoweretheworlds envy, as poſſeſſed of ſome ſmall portion of Liberty, will be ſunk in the depth of Slavery and Miſery, if you prevent it not by your well-timed efforts.

Is not every day adding a new link to our chains. Is not the executive branch daily ſeizing new, unprecedented, and unwarrantable powers? Has not the Houſe of Commons (your only ſecurity from the evils of Tyranny and Ariſtacracy) joined the coalition againſt you. Is the election of its Members eith.r fair, free, or frequent. Is not its independence gone, while it is made up of Penſioners and Placemen?

We reliſh of *honeſt equality*. The principles of our forefathers become ſuſpected to us, becauſe we ſee them animating the preſent oppoſition of our children. The faults which grow out of the luxuriance of freedom, appear much more ſhocking to us than the baſe vices which are generated from the rankneſs of ſervitude. Accordingly, the leaſt reſiſtance to power appears more inexcuſable in our eyes, than the greateſt abuſes of authority. All dread of a ſtanding military force is looked on as a ſuperſtitious panick. We grow indifferent to the conſequences inevitable to ourſelves from the plan of ruling half the empire by a mercenary ſword.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 153.

A long excluſion from any ſhare in the Legiſlature of their country, has rendered the great maſs of the people indifferent whether the monopoly that ſubſiſts, continues in the hands of a more or leſs extended company; or whether it is divided by them into ſhares of ſomewhat more or leſs proportions. The public feels itſelf unconcerned in theſe conteſts, *except as to the oppreſſions it endures*, and the exactions it ſuffers, which it knows muſt continue ſo long as the people remain deprived of all controul over their repreſentatives.

Duke of Richmond's Letter to Col. Sharman.

Parliament has already in conſideration (we ſuppoſe) of ſome expence in the beginning of your Majeſty's reign, diſcharged the debts and incumbrances on the Civil Liſt, to a very great amount. Again to exceed the revenue granted by Parliament, without its authority, and *to abuſe its indulgence* in paying one debt, by contracting in ſo ſhort a time another and a greater, is, on the firſt view, a *criminal act*. We muſt decline any concurrence in augmenting the Civil Liſt, not ſolely from motives of œconomy, but from a dread alſo of the effect of ſuch an augmentation on the *honour* and *integrity* of Parliament, by veſting ſuch large ſums, without account, in the hands of Miniſters, *when an opinion is known to prevail*, that your Majeſty's Civil Liſt revenues are *employed in creating undue influence in Parliament*, it would be extremely unbecoming of us to vote, without manifeſt reaſons, great ſums out of the property of your Majeſty's ſubjects, *which are ſuppoſed to be applied to our private emolument*. It is our duty to attend to the reputation of Parliament, and we beg leave to repreſent

preſent to your Majeſty, that a further increaſe of the *preſent over-grown influence of the Crown* would be a *treacherous gift* from Parliament, even to the Crown itſelf; as it will enable the Miniſters to carry on thoſe *deluſive ſyſtems* which have been fatally adopted, and which, if purſued, *muſt lead to ruin.*

See the Lord's Proteſt againſt an increaſe of the Civil Liſt Revenue in 1777, ſigned, Portland, Devonſhire, Rockingham, Fitzwilliam, Abingdon, &c. &c.

We have done our duty and are determined to keep to our poſts, ever ready to aſſert our juſt rights and privileges as men, the chief of which we account the Right of Univerſal Suffrage, in the choice of thoſe who ſerve in the Commons Houſe of Parliament, and a frequent renewal of ſuch power.

But they tell us that thoſe of our fellow citizens whoſe chains we have a little relaxed, are enemies to Liberty and our free Conſtitution.—Not enemies, I preſume, to their *own* Liberty. And as to the Conſtitution, *until we give them ſome ſhare in it*, I do not know on what pretence we can examine into their opinions on a buſineſs in which they have no intereſt or concern. Nor do I believe that any good Conſtitutions of Government, or of Freedom, can find it neceſſary for their ſecurity to doom any part of the people to a permanent Slavery. Such a Conſtitution of Freedom, if ſuch can be, is, in effect, no more than another name for the tyranny of the ſtrongeſt faction. It is but too true, that there are many whoſe whole ſcheme of freedom is made up of pride, perverſeneſs, and inſolence. This way of proſcribing the citizens by denominations and general deſcriptions, dignified by the name of Reaſon of State, and ſecurity for conſtitutions and commonwealths, is nothing better at bottom, than the miſerable invention of an ungenerous ambition, which would fain hold the ſacred truſt of power, without any of the virtues or any of the energies that give a title to it; a receipt of policy made up of a deteſtable compound of malice, cowardice and ſloth. *They would govern men againſt their will*; but in that government they would be diſcharged from the exerciſe of vigilance, providence, and fortitude; and, therefore, that they may ſleep on their watch, they conſent to take *ſome one diviſion* of the ſociety into partnerſhip *of the tyranny over the reſt*. But let the government in what form it may be, comprehend *the whole* in its juſtice.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 320, &c.

They who call upon you (the Houſe of Commons) to belong *wholly* to the *People*, are thoſe who wiſh you to return to your *proper* home; to the

ſphere of your duty, to the poſt of your honour, to the Manſion Houſe of all genuine, ſerene, and ſolid ſatisfaction. We have furniſhed to the People of England (indeed we have) ſome real cauſe of jealouſy. Let us return to our legitimate home. Let the commons in Parliament aſſembled, be one and the ſame thing with the Commons at large. The diſtinctions that are made to ſeparate us, are unnatural and wicked contrivances. Let us identify, let us incorporate ourſelves *with the People.*

Burke, Vol. II. p. 264.

We are not deterred or diſappointed by the deciſion of the Houſe of Commons concerning our petition. It is a queſtion we did not expect (though founded on truth and reaſon) would be ſupported by ſuperior numbers.—Far from being diſcouraged, we are more and more convinced that nothing can ſave this nation from ruin, and give to the People that happineſs which they have a right to look for under Government, but a Reform in the Houſe of Commons, founded upon the eternal baſis of juſtice, fair, free, and equal.

The leſſer reform has been attempted with every poſſible advantage in its favour; not only from the zealous ſupport of the advocates for a more effectual one, but from the aſſiſtance of men of great weight, both in and out of power. But with all theſe temperaments and helps it has failed. Not one proſelyte has been gained from corruption, nor has the leaſt ray of hope been held out from any quarter, that the Houſe of Commons was inclined to adopt any other mode of reform. The weight of corruption has cruſhed this more gentle, as it would have defeated any more efficacious plan in the ſame circumſtances. From that quarter, therefore, I have nothing to hope. IT IS FROM THE PEOPLE AT LARGE THAT I EXPECT ANY GOOD. And I am convinced, that the only way to make them feel that they are really concerned in the buſineſs, is to contend for their full, clear, and indiſputable rights of Univerſal Repreſentation.

The ſubject of a Parliamentary Reform is that which of all others, in my opinion, moſt deſerves the attention of the public, as I conceive it would include every other advantage which a nation can wiſh; and I have no heſitation in ſaying, I am more and more convinced that the *reſtoring the right of voting univerſally to every man, not incapacitated by nature for want of reaſon, or by law for the commiſſion of crimes, together with annual elections,* is the only reform that can be effectual and permanent.

Duke of Richmond's Letter to Col. Sharman.

But what (ſays the Financier) is peace to us without money? Your plan gives us no revenue. No!—But it does. For it *ſecures to the ſubject* the *power* of REFUSAL; the *firſt* of all revenues.—Experience is a cheat, and fact a liar, if *this power in the ſubject of proportioning his grant,* or of not *granting at all,* has not been found the richeſt mine

Fellow

of

of revenue ever discovered by the skill or by the fortune of one man.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 91.

Liberty, if I understand it all, is a *general* principle, and the clear Right of *all* the Subjects within the Realm, or of none. Partial Freedom seems to me a most invidious mode of slavery.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 111.

Fellow Citizens,

The time is now come when you must either gather round the Fabric of Liberty to support it, or to your eternal infamy, let it fall to the ground, to rise no more, hurling along with it every thing that is valuable and dear to an enlightened people.

You are plunged into a War by a Wicked Ministry and compliant Parliament who seem careless and unconcerned for your interest, the aid and design of which is almost too horrid too relate, the destruction of a whole People, merely because they will be free.

I am thoroughly persuaded that the last hopes of preserving the spirit of the English Constitution, or of reuniting the dissipated Members of the English race upon a common plan of tranquillity and Liberty, does entirely depend on their firm and lasting union; and above all on the keeping themselves from that despair, which is so very apt to fall on those, whom a violence of character and a mixture of ambitious views, do not support, through a long, painful and unsuccessful struggle.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 153.

"A Wicked Ministry."—*Read Mr. Burke's Picture of Lord North in* 1777.

I may be unable to lend an helping hand to those who direct the State; but I should be ashamed to make myself one of a noisy Multitude to hollow and hearten them into doubtful and dangerous courses. A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood. It is no excuse for presumptuous ignorance that it is directed by insolent passion. I cannot conceive any existence under heaven, that is more truly odious and disgusting than an impotent helpless creature, without civil wisdom or military skill, without a consciousness of any other qualification for Power but his servility to it, bloated with pride and arrogance, calling for battles which he is not to fight, contending for a violent dominion which he can never exercise, and satisfied himself to be mean and miserable, in order to render others contemptible and wretched.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 1[illegible].

If I had not lived long enough to be little surprised at any thing, I should have been in some degree astonished at the continued rage of several gentlemen, who not satisfied with carrying fire and sword into America, are animated nearly with the same fury against those neighbours of theirs whose only crime it is, that they have charitably and humanely

manely wiſhed them to entertain more reaſonable ſentiments, and not always to ſacrifice their intereſt to their paſſion. All this rage againſt unreſiſting diſſent, convinces me, that at bottom, they are far from ſatisfied they are in the right. For what is it they would have? A War? They certainly have at this moment the bleſſing of ſomething that is very like one; and if the War they enjoy at preſent be not ſufficiently hot and extenſive, they may ſhortly have it as warm and as ſpreading as their hearts can deſire. Is it the force of the Kingdom they call for? They have it already; and if they chooſe to fight their battles in perſon, nobody prevents their ſetting ſail for America in the next Tranſports. Do they think that the ſervice is ſtinted for want of liberal ſupplies? Indeed they complain without reaſon. The table of the Houſe of Commons will glut them, let their appetite for expence be never ſo keen. And I do aſſure them further, that thoſe who think with them in the Houſe of Commons *are full as eaſy in the control*, as they are liberal in the vote of theſe expences. Tolerated in their paſſions, let them learn not to perſecute the moderation of their fellow citizens. If all the world joined them in a full cry againſt Rebellion, and were as hotly inflamed againſt the whole theory and enjoyment of Freedom, as thoſe who are the moſt factious for ſervitude, it could not in my opinion anſwer any one end in this conteſt. *If we all adopted their ſentiments to a Man their Allies, the ſavage Indians, could not be more ferocious than they are; they could not* MURDER *one more helpleſs woman or child, or with more exquiſite refinements of cruelty,* TORMENT TO DEATH *one more of their Engliſh fleſh and blood than they do already.* The public money is given to purchaſe *this Alliance*;—and they have their bargain. Burke, Vol. II. p. 126 and 7.

To conſider the neceſſary repriſal of an unhappy, *proſcribed, interdicted* people, (the Americans) as the crime of piracy would have appeared to *any other legiſlature than ours*, a ſtrain of the *moſt inſulting* and *moſt unnatural cruelty and injuſtice.*

Burke, Vol. II. p. 105.

By it your commerce is ſore cramped and almoſt ruined. Thouſands and tens of thouſands of your fellow citizens, from being in

Indeed our affairs are in a bad condition. I do aſſure thoſe Gentlemen who have prayed for War, and obtained the bleſſing they have ſought, that they are at this inſtant in very great ſtraits. The abuſed wealth of this Country continues a little longer to feed its diſtemper.

Burke Vol. II. p. 117.

The

in a ſtate of proſperity, are reduced to a ſtate of poverty, miſery, and wretchedneſs. A liſt of bankruptcies, unequalled in any former times, forms a part in the retinue of this Quixottic expedition; your taxes great and burthenſome as they are, muſt ſoon be greatly augmented; your treaſure is waſting faſt; the blood of your brethren is pouring out, and all this to form chains for a free people, and eventually to rivet them for ever on yourſelves.

To the loſs of the invaluable rights and privileges which our fathers enjoyed, we impute this barbarous and calamitous War, our ruinous and ſtill growing taxation, and all the miſeries and oppreſſions which we labour under.

The trade of America is to be dealt out in private indulgences and graces; that is in *Jobs* to recompenſe the *Incendiaries of War.*

Burke, Vol. II. p. 125.

In order to prove that the Americans have no right to their liberties, we are every day endeavouring to ſubvert the maxims which preſerve our own. To prove that the Americans ought not to be free, we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itſelf; and we never ſeem to gain a paltry advantage over them in Debate without attacking ſome of thoſe principles, or deriding ſome of thoſe feelings, for which our anceſtors have ſhed their blood.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 47.

The true danger is when Liberty is nibled away, for expedients, and by parts. There is no equality among us; we are not fellow citizens, if the mariner who lands on the quay, does not reſt on as firm legal ground, as the merchant who ſits in his compting houſe. (*Alluding to the partial ſuſpenſion of the Habeas Corpus which took place in* 1777.) Other Laws may injure the community, this *diſſolves it.*

Burke, Vol. II. p. 113.

We are heartily agreed in our deteſtation of a civil War. We have even expreſſed the moſt unqualified diſapprobation of all the ſteps which have led to it, and of all thoſe which tend to prolong it. And I have no doubt that we feel exactly the ſame emotions of *grief* and *ſhame* on all its miſerable conſequences; whether they appear on the one ſide or the other, in the ſhape of *victories* or defeats, of captures made from the Engliſh on the Continent, or from the Engliſh in theſe Iſlands; of legiſlative regulations which *ſubvert the Liberties* of our brethren, or which *undermine our own.*

Burke, Vol. II. p. 103.

Fellow Citizens,

The Friends of Liberty call upon you by

It is impoſſible that we ſhould remain long in a ſituation, which breeds ſuch notions and diſpoſitions, without ſome great alteration in the National,

by all that is dear and worthy of poſſeſſing as men; by your own oppreſſions; by the miſeries and ſorrows of your ſuffering brethren; by all that you dread; by the ſweet remembrance of your patriotic anceſtors; and by all that your poſterity have a right to expect from you,—to join us in our exertions for the preſervation of our periſhing Liberty, and the recovery of our long loſt rights.

tional character. Thoſe ingenuous and feeling minds who are ſo fortified againſt all other things, and ſo unarmed to whatever approaches in the ſhape of diſgrace, finding theſe principles which they conſidered as ſure means of honour to be grown into diſrepute, will retire diſheartened and diſguſted. Thoſe of a more robuſt make, the bold, able, ambitious men, who pay ſome of their court to power through the people, and ſubſtitute the voice of tranſient opinion in the place of true glory, will give into the general mode; and thoſe ſuperior underſtandings, which ought to correct vulgar prejudice, will confirm and aggravate its errors. Many things have been long operating towards a gradual change in our principles. But this American War has done more in a very few years than all the other cauſes would have effected in a century. For that reaſon, I entreat you again and again, neither to be perſuaded, ſhamed, or frighted out of the principles that have hitherto led ſo many of you *to abhor the War*, its cauſes, and conſequences. Let us not be amongſt the firſt who renounce the maxims of our forefathers.

Burke, Vol. II. p. 154.

In theſe Extracts we find the very ſubſtance from which Mr. Palmer's Hand-Bill is ſtolen. That Gentleman, it ſeems, ſaid, the Parliament was made up of Placemen and Penſioners, but we find the Duke of Portland, &c. had ſet him a Precedent: His diſpondency at the decay and unpopularity of Liberty is a poor imitation of Mr. Burke: His opinions on univerſal ſuffrage are filched from the Duke of Richmond, and alſo confirmed by the doctrines of Mr. Burke, who ſays, it is a tyranny to govern a people *againſt their will*, and maintains, that taxation ought to originate with the people. If Mr. Palmer ſays, we are making War for the deſtruction of a whole people, Mr. Burke has ſaid, that we hired ſavages to *murder* our Engliſh brethren in America, and that the Legiſlature had *cruelly* and *unjuſtly proſcribed* that people. Can there be a more wicked Miniſter than that deſcribed by Mr. Burke? Is Mr. Palmer's aſſertion of the compliancy of our Parliament worſe than Mr. Burke's inſinuation of their *eaſineſs of controul* and avowal, that the wealth of the nation *is abuſed*? Could there be a greater Libel than a Britiſh ſubject's aſſerting, he felt grief and ſhame at the victories of Britiſh troops; that the trade of America was dealt out to the incendiaries of War; or than, that the Legiſlature had made an Act which *diſſolved* the community? Theſe Extracts contain not only the ſentiments of Mr. Palmer, but they contain them in much more violent language; and Mr. Burke, the Dukes of Richmond and Portland, &c. may thank God that the Scotch Law was not introduced into England, while it ſuited their purpoſes to ſupport the Cauſe of Freedom.

FINIS.